

July 22, 1965

A3989

Communist yoke in the subjugated nations.

We are reading and hearing a great deal these days of the increasing ferment within the Communist bloc—of the Sino-Soviet rift, of the unrest and frustration of farmers and consumers in Russia, and of the increasing independence of satellite Communist governments from the influence of headquarters in Moscow. We are encouraged by reports of imminent revolution and seething resentment in many of these captive satellites. We are optimistic over the threatened defection of China from Kremlin leadership and the possible internal rupture that could hasten the downfall of both governments. We are anxiously hopeful over signs that a measure of freedom is being restored through such minor incidents as the sudden resumption of the sale of western newspapers in Bucharest. We are hopeful that these are all genuine signs of the hastening doom of world communism and Red totalitarianism.

If these are genuine indicators of such a trend; if, indeed, we can believe our eyes and ears, what better way to expedite the process than by demonstrating our concern and anxiety through establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. We can solidify and strengthen the natural bonds that connect us with these eastern and central European peoples. We can encourage them to press further, to demand the rights of freemen, to demand the right to choose their own government. And, perhaps most importantly, we can forge a two-way link of communication between ourselves and these peoples. We can provide a national focus to better assess these events, to better judge the mood and tenor of their society, to know better how and where we can apply peaceful pressures to hasten their deliverance.

There is, naturally, a counterbalance of opinion that suggests these so-called changes behind the Iron Curtain are mere propaganda, false and distorted rumors designed to lull ourselves and the rest of the free world into mood of optimistic complacency. The claim is made that, from a practical point of view, things are no different in Poland, Hungary, Rumania, or anywhere else in the Red sphere than they were almost 20 years ago. Certainly there is ample evidence to support this contention.

Free elections are proclaimed, but the list of Communist candidates leaves little to choose between. Freedom of speech is proclaimed, but we listen in vain for the voices of dissent. Self-determination is proclaimed but we wait in vain for our friends and loved ones to cross the frontiers. Symbolically and actually, the Berlin Wall still stands.

So the point remains, I say, that no matter how you gage events inside the Communist satellites, inside Russia, and inside the entire Communist orbit, it is vitally important that we strengthen our knowledge of these events. It is important that we know what is going on there, not only out of sympathy for the captive people within—who are in fact mother and father, brother, and sister to so many of us in the United States—but from the

very practical position of our own national security.

It should not be necessary any more to emphasize the significance of internal events behind the Iron Curtain with respect to our national security. The threat of world communism is a genuine, demonstrated reality. We have heard with our own ears the outrageous threats from Communist leaders that they will bury us, and that our grandchildren will be Communists. There can be no mistaking the intent of world communism.

And there is no better way to assess the next manifestation of that intent, or to gage the determination and depth of the next thrust, than to know what is going on behind the Iron Curtain. We cannot ignore the captive nations of Europe any more than we can ignore the future of our own Nation.

The captive nations movement is grounded on the exhaustive exploitation of all possible peaceful means to bring about the liberation of these people. The word peaceful should be emphasized. Among this arsenal are economic weapons of devastating impact. Propaganda devices of frightful power, and the more subtle tactics involved in such things as international trade fairs where the observers from Iron Curtain countries can see for themselves the tremendous outpouring of consumer goods from free capitalist societies.

A Special Captive Nations Committee in this body would go a long way toward improving our activities in all these areas and bringing them into sharper focus. We must keep a clear and alert eye on these nations, in spite of the desperate need for vigilance and preparedness in Vietnam and the rest of southeast Asia. This focus, this important link could be forged in this body through action on House Resolution 140 which I have introduced in the present Congress.

Whatever assessment we make of the political and social climate in Europe today, I think we must agree that the rock of international communism has been nudged a little. Now is the time to put every shoulder against it to keep it moving, to push it over the brink of oblivion. We must not turn our backs and expect it to roll away of its own accord. There are strong forces on the other side who are pushing just as hard to roll the stone over us.

George McLain

SPEECH
OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of George McLain was a great loss for senior citizens all across this country. He devoted his life to their causes. A resourceful man, he mastered the techniques of legislative advocacy, which he practiced in both Sacramento and Washington, D.C., to the immense

benefit of all senior citizens. His death was not only a great shock to his many, many friends, but to all those who worked so hard for and with him in his battle for senior citizens, and to all those who benefited from his great work.

The Other Side of the Coin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Much has been said for wilderness areas and wild rivers programs, often at the expense of the idea of the development of water resources; and overlooking the wonderful job done by our Bureau of Reclamation and other water resource agencies over the years.

I am not opposed to wilderness areas, nor am I opposed to wild rivers. However, I think it is important that we not forget the other side of the coin which I believe was well illustrated in a recent editorial published in the Eastern Idaho Farmer, Idaho Falls, Idaho.

The editorial follows:

[From the Eastern Idaho Farmer, June 10, 1965]

Amid all of the chatter about the preservation of "wild rivers," the U.S. Interior Department has just published a brochure titled "Lake Powell, Jewel of the Colorado."

That brochure prompted John Corlett of the Boise Statesman to make this pertinent observation:

"It is time the people of this Nation were properly educated and told that reclamation and dam building has done more for recreation, benefitting all people, in the West than any other role performed by Government.

An the same recreation benefits exist on the large reservoirs behind private power dams."

It's a point which is generally overlooked. A "wild river" is an inaccessible river. Only 900 people, before Lake Powell, traversed that stretch of the Colorado River. Today, the lake's entire 1,860-mile shoreline is accessible—and millions of people will see it.

What will they see? Floyd Dominy, U.S. Commissioner of Reclamation, has a few words on Lake Powell in that brochure. He calls it an "aquatic wonder," emphasizes the fact that the lake's water is blue and crystal clear and then he adds:

"You have a front-row seat in an amphitheater of infinity. The bright blue sky deepens slowly to a velvet purple and the stars are brilliant—glittering in that vast immensity above. Orange sandstone cliffs fade to dusky red—then to deepest black. The fire burns low, reflected in the placid lake. There is peace. And a oneness with the world and God."

The point which Mr. Corlett make is pertinent. If river areas are to be opened to general public enjoyment, dams and reservoirs provide the way to do it. In eastern Idaho, Island Park and Palisades Reservoirs are perfect examples.

It reminds us, too, of this crazy concept of setting wilderness areas aside. For what? For those few who will undergo the rigors of primitive camp life to see what's locked up so far as the general public is concerned.

Wild rivers are fine—if you don't want anybody to see them.

July 22, 1965

The Larger War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that our policy in Vietnam has been a failure. It has failed to either contain communism or strengthen democracy. The administration is currently conducting high-level discussions seeking to develop either new policies, or better ways of implementing the old policies. The consequences of the discussions now going on could be either a new world war, or major progress toward world peace. Every Member of the Congress should be deeply concerned about the decisions being made in the name of the United States, decisions which, insofar as they involve the United States in a state of war, are the constitutional prerogative of the Congress.

Columnist Walter Lippmann points out the complexity and delicacy surrounding any decision that is made in his article published in today's Washington Post. I hope that every one of my colleagues will take the time to read this column, which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. Mr. Lippmann does his usual excellent job of pinpointing many of the questions to which we should devote our attention most seriously during the next few days.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 22, 1965]

THE LARGER WAR

(By Walter Lippmann)

Secretary McNamara's return from Saigon has set the stage for a decision which has been anticipated for a long time. Ever since it has become evident that the air strikes would not bring the Indochinese war to an end, it has been virtually certain that the American troop commitment would be greatly increased.

The air strikes were tried out as a relatively cheap and easy way of compensating for and covering up the defeat of the South Vietnamese Army. In the past 6 months the plight of the Saigon Army has become worse and worse, and today its reserves are used up, its troops are deserting in masses, the villages from which it could draw new recruits are in Vietcong hands, communications with the few centers that it still holds are substantially cut.

The decline of the South Vietnamese Army has gone so far that President Johnson is confronted with the question of waging an American war. The crucial question which has to be decided is not how many more American soldiers shall be put ashore in Vietnam. Although this question is of enormous importance to the men themselves and to their families, although Congress and the country are vitally interested because it is certain to involve at least a partial mobilization, the crucial question nevertheless is what the President intends to ask this large American Army to do. Will he give it a mission that can be accomplished? Or will he send it on a fool's errand as all our previous missions in South Vietnam have proved to be—the conquering and occupation of the villages and the countryside by American soldiers?

There is no indication as yet that the President has reached a decision on this fundamental strategic issue. The buildup of American forces does not decide the issue—which is whether the troops are going ashore in order to affirm the American presence during a negotiation for a political settlement, or whether they are the vanguard of a crusade to push communism back of the 17th parallel, to teach China a lesson, to prove that Americans always win their wars. This is the issue that has to be decided, and in a self-respecting free society it would now be soberly and gravely debated.

The President has said enough to keep open his own power to choose. He has often said that he wants a limited war and a negotiated settlement. But again and again he has resorted to the hot slogans which, if taken at face value, would mean not a limited war but a total war. There is no assurance that the country will not be nudged and jostled as it has been for a decade in Indochina—until it slithers and slides into a total war.

We are now in sight of a total war. We shall be much nearer the brink if we transform our intervention to help the Saigon Government into an American war against the Vietcong and Hanoi. For with the crumbling of the Saigon army, with the defeat of the Saigon Government in almost the whole territory of South Vietnam, with the corrosion and corruption of the government in Saigon itself, we are confronted with the proposal to replace the South Vietnamese with Americans, to replace our advisers, and to take command of the war, and—invariably as a result—to establish an American military government in Saigon to rule the native politicians and generals.

Can there be any serious question that such an expansion of American military power on the Asian mainland is likely to mean a war to the bitter end, not only against the Vietcong and Hanoi, but against China as well.

This is the point on which the country needs to be informed. It needs to be assured from the President himself that we are not enlarging our troop commitment in order to fight an Asian war with an American army and an American command and a military government. For on what terms would we fight such a war, and where could it end? It is too late in the day to worry about protocol, about consulting the United Nations or about consulting Congress and the people. But it is not too late, though it is the 11th hour, to ask and be told whether this is still to be a limited war.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH
OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1965

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this time to express my deepest congratulations to my neighbor, the Congressman now in the well, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood].

As he is honored tonight by the Captive Nations Assembly, certainly they pay honor to a man who has done more in my judgment than any single individual in either body of this great Congress to keep alive the light of conscience and the light of hope for so many people over whom has descended the long night of darkness.

It is a great pleasure for me to extend these compliments to my friend from Wilkes-Barre.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by saying when they do honor tonight to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman Flood, they do honor to the effort he has made to try to bring the hope of freedom to these people who exist today in slavery in much of the world.

Five Wishes for My Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, recently, an essay was brought to my attention which was composed by Miss Geraldine Marie Crowle, a 10-year-old student of the Village School, San Lorenzo, Calif. This essay was written to be entered in the annual American Legion essay contest which is intended to encourage patriotism among school children of our Nation.

Miss Crowle's essay won first prize in her own school district and placed second in the State competition. It is entitled "Five Wishes for My Country," and I think her remarks are a very warm and distinct tribute to our Nation and its ideals.

I am very proud to think that a young lady of Miss Crowle's years demonstrate so much interest in her country and its greatness. It is for this reason I would like to share this essay with you and my colleagues:

FIVE WISHES FOR MY COUNTRY

(By Geraldine Marie Crowle, San Lorenzo, Calif., March 15, 1965)

Our country has many wonderful resources and we have ideas about the use of these resources. In order to have a more perfect country we need many ideas in the hope that some day the best ideas will be carried out. The following are my five ideas or wishes for my country.

My first wish is that our country will always be free. This would mean that every person would be free to think and say and do as he thinks best. We don't realize how valuable this freedom is until we read about other countries that have lost it or where it has been lost in our own land.

My second wish is for prosperity. People need to have plenty to eat, a good place to live and warm clothing. People need these things to be healthy and happy.

A third wish is that everyone who wants to work could find employment. People need to work in order to feel useful to their fellow men and to make a living for themselves and their families. Keeping everybody at work will help make our country prosperous and more happy.

My fourth wish is that all children may go to school at least through high school so they will have a good education. Also, I hope that many young people will be able to go to college. This will train our scientists, doctors, teachers, lawyers, engineers, ministers, and others we need to keep our country great.

My fifth and last hope is for peace. A peace-loving nation is respected by all other

July 22, 1965

pled, the world will need a new and assured source of growing liquidity to support increasing world trade and investment.

This, in a nutshell, is what the issue of world monetary reform is all about. It is to assure ample world liquidity for the years ahead that the United States, in cooperation with other leading financial powers, is seeking workable ways of strengthening and improving international financial arrangements.

For several years now the essential laying of the technical groundwork has been underway as the United States has joined with other major countries in comprehensive studies of the international monetary system—its recent evolution, its present effectiveness and its future. An early conclusion was that there are two elements in international liquidity; on the one hand the more conventional reserves of gold and reserve currencies and on the other hand the ready availability of credit facilities for countries in need of temporary assistance.

As long ago as 1961 the 10 major industrial nations, now known as the Group of 10, negotiated with the International Monetary Fund a so-called general arrangements to borrow whereby the 10 nations agreed to lend to the IMF up to \$6 billion should this be necessary "to forestall or cope with an impairment of the international monetary system." That arrangement was activated last December and again this May in order to provide a part of a \$2.4 billion drawings from the IMF on the part of the United Kingdom.

On the credit side, also, the members of the International Monetary Fund have now agreed to support a 25-percent general increase in IMF quotas. This 25-percent increase, plus special increases for some 16 countries, will raise total aggregate quotas from \$15 billion to around \$21 billion. The Congress last month approved a \$1,035 million increase in the U.S. quota.

Meanwhile, the Group of 10 and the International Monetary Fund have been continuing their studies of the future course of world liquidity. Deputies of the Group submitted a comprehensive report on the problems involved last August. In their ministerial statement last August, the Group of 10 stated that while supplies of gold and reserve currencies are fully adequate for the present and are likely to be for the immediate future the continuing growth of world trade and payments is likely to require larger international liquidity. While they said that this need might be met by an expansion of credit facilities, they added that it may possibly call for some new form of reserve asset.

A study group was set up "to examine various proposals regarding the creation of reserve assets either through the IMF or otherwise." The efforts of that group have culminated in the so-called Ossola report, submitted to the deputies of the Group of 10 on June 1 of this year, which exhaustively examines, with all their promises and pitfalls, the possible paths to the creation of reserve assets.

Now for the first time in 4 years we are confronted by the happy concurrence of three crucial facts:

1. The U.S. balance of payments is approaching an equilibrium and the executive branch, the Congress and the private sector, including industry, banking and labor, have mounted a program that makes unmistakably manifest our determination to keep it that way.

2. Evidence is accumulating of a rising tide of opinion in many knowledgeable and influential quarters in the free world, private and public, that our international monetary arrangements can and should be substantially improved, building on the basis of the International Monetary Fund and the network of more informal inter-

national monetary cooperation that has marked recent years.

3. The completion of technical studies necessary to give a thorough understanding of the problem and various alternative approaches to solution on the part of those at the highest levels of government who must ultimately make these decisions.

We have now reached the moment which President Johnson had in mind when in speaking of new international monetary steps he said: "We must press forward with our studies and beyond, to action—evolving arrangements which will continue to meet the needs of a fast growing world economy. Unless we can make timely progress, international monetary difficulties will exercise a stubborn and increasingly frustrating drag on our policies for prosperity and progress at home and throughout the world."

In taking office, I described this as "the major task facing our Treasury and the financial authorities of the rest of the free world in the next few years."

In recent weeks we have moved beyond the plane of hope and technical studies toward the prospect of more conclusive negotiations from which alone solution can emerge. I met last week with the British Chancellor of the Exchequer James Callaghan and we exchanged preliminary and tentative views on the subject of international liquidity.

Next week I hope to have the pleasure of informal discussions with the Japanese Minister of Finance, Takeo Fukuda, in connection with the Joint Cabinet sessions of the United States-Japan Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs.

Both before and after the scheduled meeting of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank in late September, I expect to visit ranking financial officials of other group of 10 countries, to ascertain firsthand their views on the most practical and promising ways of furthering progress toward improved international monetary arrangements. We must not only be prepared to advance our own proposals, but to carefully consider and fairly weight the merits of other proposals. As Congressman ROBERT ELLS-worth, of Kansas, in discussing this subject recently remarked: "We must appreciate that if we wish a strong Europe it must be a Europe strong enough to look upon an American proposal as merely one among many possible solutions—all of which will be reviewed together. If we wish their partnership, we must treat them as partners."

Already your Government is engaged in an intensive internal preparation for these bilateral meetings and multilateral negotiations that should follow. In addition, so that the Government may have the benefit of some of the expertise and experience outside the Government in this highly technical area, President Johnson has accepted my recommendation and announced creation of an Advisory Committee on International Monetary Arrangements which includes as its Chairman the former Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, and a distinguished group of experts including Robert Roosa, former Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs; Kermit Gordon, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget; Edward Bernstein, economic consultant specializing in international monetary policy; Andre Meyer, of the investment banking firm of Lazard Freres; David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and Charles Kindleberger, professor of economics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

With the help and that of many others who will be consulted including, particularly, many well informed members of the appropriate committees of Congress we shall constantly seek a comprehensive U.S. position and negotiating strategy

designed to achieve substantial improvement in international monetary arrangements thoroughly compatible with our national interests. In the various proposals which have and will be made we must determine those which will be acceptable to the United States, those which are entirely unacceptable, and those which may well be appropriate for negotiation.

There will be an initial meeting of the Advisory Committee on International Arrangements on July 16. Hearings are planned before the International Finance Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee under the chairmanship of Congressman HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, to obtain various private and organizational points of view. These hearings and the reports of the committee will be of great value, together with those of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress and the International Finance Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee under the chairmanship of Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, of Maine.

I am privileged to tell you this evening that the President has authorized me to announce that the United States now stands prepared to attend and participate in an international monetary conference that would consider what steps we might jointly take to secure substantial improvements in international monetary arrangements. Needless to say, if such a conference is to lead to a fruitful and creative resolution by some of the free world's monetary problems, it must be preceded by careful preparation and international consultation.

To meet and not succeed would be worse than not meeting at all. Before any conference takes place, there should be a reasonable certainty of measurable progress through prior agreement on basic points.

Our suggestion is that the work of preparation be undertaken by a preparatory committee which could be given its terms of reference at the time of the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund this September.

The United States is not wedded to this procedure nor to any rigid timetable. I shall exchange views with my colleagues in Europe and elsewhere, as well as with the senior officials of the International Monetary Fund, on how best to proceed. The point I wish to emphasize here is that the United States is determined to move ahead—carefully, deliberately—but without delay. Not to act when the time is ripe can be as unwise as to act too soon or too hastily.

We are, therefore, moving ahead—and we are making progress. But we must be aware that the issues involved are complex, and they raise basic questions of national interest. It is not, therefore, easy to arrive at the degree of international consensus we must have for any workable reform of the international monetary system. We can expect no overnight solution—but only patient exploration of the alternatives with our trading partners in a spirit of mutual cooperation. This is the course we are now pursuing.

As we move ahead, we will do well to remember that the existing international financial system has successfully financed an unparalleled expansion in world trade and payments. We have also done much in recent years to strengthen that system. The need now is not to start all over again, to move in a completely new direction. Rather, we must move once more to strengthen and improve the existing arrangements.

And while we proceed solidly and surely toward international agreement on the problems of world liquidity, we in this country must keep ever before us the present and pressing need to protect the existing international payments system by maintaining a strong, sound and stable dollar.

A3988

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 22, 1965

First things must come first. We are bringing our own payments into equilibrium and we must keep them in equilibrium. By resolutely shouldering that responsibility we will preserve the foundation upon which must rest all efforts to assure free world growth in the years ahead—the monetary system that has served the free world so well in the past.

See (On) Hansen
Labor Union Communists and Our
Vietnam Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a very thoughtful letter from two of my constituents in which several very pertinent and pointed questions are raised; and in which are also stated some very fundamental beliefs—beliefs which I feel are shared, in a large part, by a vast majority of Americans.

Under leave to include extraneous material, I am including at this point, the letter:

MOUNTAIN HOME, IDAHO,
July 13, 1965.

HON. GEORGE HANSEN,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. HANSEN: Enclosed is our American Legion magazine vote concerning foreign aid. Also, we wish to comment on the recent Supreme Court decision concerning the holding of labor union offices by Communists, and the policy in Vietnam.

Mr. HANSEN, we wish to know how, if at all, a private citizen can influence a decision of the Supreme Court? It seems that some of the recent decisions have been a tremendous victory for the criminals and Communists. The latest example is the decision of the Supreme Court concerning the holding of labor union office by Communists as shown in the attached newspaper clipping.

It is taught in general ethics that an assailant bent on murder temporarily yields his right to life to that of the person being attacked. We believe the same logic holds true of the American Communist who seeks his constitutional rights of holding labor union leadership. We believe that a person belonging to an organization dedicated to the overthrow of the U.S. Government yields any rights given to him by the Constitution.

We did not vote for President Johnson in the last presidential elections but support fully his strong efforts in stemming the tide of the Communists in southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic.

But why must the United States be so involved with our own fighting troops in Vietnam? Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek has been and is willing to fight the Communists. If but a small part of our foreign aid is shunted over to him, it seems that America's armed participation would be greatly reduced.

We are against repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, section 14(b). If 14(b) is repealed, the political future of America is at stake, domination of our Government by union officials. In view of the Supreme Court decision mentioned above, it would make one shudder at the thought of our Nation being paralyzed by a general strike perpetuated by Communist union officials.

In these days of Communists, criminals, and leftists demanding their constitutional rights, how about a common ordinary citizen asking for his constitutional rights and ask that he continue having the choice of joining a labor union or not?

Respectfully yours,
Mr. and Mrs. JOHN BARUTIA.

Bread Tax?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY L. GREIGG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1965

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the Record a fine editorial from the highly respected Midwestern magazine, "Wallaces Farmer".

I wish the RECORD to show this fine statement which denounces the false issue of "bread tax" in reference to the farm program.

BREAD TAX?

We have some real questions on the desirability of pegging the price of wheat used in the United States at 100 percent of parity (around \$2.50 a bushel). But we also feel that the "bread tax" arguments being used against the proposed plan to do so are lacking in integrity and commonsense.

The bread tax claim was first raised last year when the present certificates plan was proposed and passed. Put in effect for the 1964 crop, the wheat plan required millers to buy "certificates" costing 70 cents per bushel for all wheat processed for domestic consumption.

Since the loan price plus direct payment was lowered 70 cents, the cost of wheat to millers was left at substantially the same level. Even so, the 70-cent certificates were labeled "bread tax" by farm program enemies. No price boost or bread tax was involved.

The figures for the past year prove that no price boost or "bread tax" was involved. Consumer prices for wheat products remained stable over the past year. All that happened was that some \$300 million of producer income was charged to consumers instead of taxpayers.

The cry of "bread tax" is being used again this year to fight the proposed boost in the value of wheat certificates to \$1.25. Main push is coming from a new lobbying group called the Wheat Users Committee, which is supported by 23 commercial baking companies.

There's a bit more basis for the bread tax claim on the 50-cent boost in the cost of wheat certificates. Even so, the claims are vicious and for practical purposes, fictitious.

The Wheat Users Committee claims the boost would raise bread prices 2 cents a loaf. Fact: it would raise them only 0.7 cent per loaf. A tax on poor people? It would raise bread costs only about \$1.60 per year for the average family. And genuinely poor people are eligible for free flour from surplus commodity distributions of low-cost food through the food stamp plan.

The bakers have their hopes set on \$1.25 wheat, of course, the present national average loan price. This would drop the cost of their major purchases around 37½ percent from present levels, and 50 percent from the levels proposed in the new farm bill.

Would this bonanza end up in the pockets of the poor people for whom WUC seems to have so much concern? Of course, not. But it would provide some nice boosts in profits for people in the baking business, and without any painful raising of prices.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, our observance of National Captive Nations Week this year takes on added significance for Americans, coming as it does so soon after the passing of one of our more enlightened champions of world peace and freedom, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson. It is hardly necessary for me or any Member of this body to recall the lofty dedication and total commitment of this gifted and courageous man. We mourn his passing with the certain knowledge that we can ill afford to lose his vision and leadership in these troubled times.

Our observance is also marked by the 20th anniversary of the end of the European war in 1945. It was just 20 years ago that the last trace of Hitlerism was, as Winston Churchill had so often prophesied, burnt off the face of Europe. It has been 20 years since the scourge of Nazi tyranny was eliminated, since men again could lift their heads from the dust and rubble without fear of having them shot away. It has been 20 years since men began again to cast fresh dreams and new hopes for the world. And, ironically, it has been scarcely less than 20 years since a new, more subtle yoke of enslavement has settled about the necks of so many of our European neighbors.

As in each of our observances of Captive Nations Week since it was inaugurated by act of Congress 6 years ago, there will be many moving and impassioned tributes made in this body and elsewhere with respect to the plight of these satellite nations and their captive peoples. We will listen to eloquent words uttered by sincere and high-minded men. Speaking for myself, I welcome this utterance. I welcome the testimonials of sympathy and praise that will surely be made. I welcome the exhortations that will be extended to the captive peoples to cling to their faith, to go on believing and hoping for the deliverance that will one day make them free to chart their own destinies, to choose their own form of government and their own way of life.

But I also seek more than oral tribute, no matter how sincere or well meant it may be. I think it is high time we provided some action to go along with the brave words. I submit that there is no more fitting time to launch such action than right now.

I am speaking, of course, of the action which I and other of my colleagues in this body have long advocated to establish a Special Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives. I submit that there has never been a clearer need for the added focus such a committee would provide, nor a better time to take advantage of the reassuring impact such a gesture will have on the people under the

July 22, 1965

A3973

President Johnson's program to beautify America is filled with challenge, inspiration and excitement that should spur us all to action. It is our duty now to carry out these ideas in practical ways through social action in our communities, States, and Nation. We can make beauty flourish in our land. We can escape and conquer the ugliness in our cities. We can purify the air we breathe and the water in our lakes and streams. We can build an America where we can share the advantages of the material progress of the 20th century without the corrupting and corroding influences of neglect and indifference and public apathy which, if unchecked, will create a chrome-plated wasteland.

The hour is late.

The challenge is existing.

The rewards are rich with opportunities for beauty and human fulfillment.

WALTER P. REUTHER,

For Hon. Robert L. Leggett
U.N. Southeast Asian Solution Explored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1965

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, thoughtful people in the free world are exhausting the available chess moves in an effort to avoid an Asian land war. The free world thought is motivated not by fear but out of a desire to thwart aggression by peaceful means.

I would suggest that the pacifists direct some of their good intentions toward Hanoi, Peiping, and the NLF, the political entities that appear to be voiceless and tongueless on this issue. With the free world attempting to exhaust every peaceful alternative and articulating well their positions, I would think that well-meaning pacifists might well question publicly the Communist motive and sincerity.

Typical of American policy expression is the following letter received from Assistant Secretary of State Douglas MacArthur II indicating the U.N. stalemate. It may well be that article 19 denying a member a vote due to nonpayment of peacekeeping activities assessments to neutralize Communist aggression destined the U.N. for the historical scrap heap anyway:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,

Washington.

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEGGETT: Thank you for your letter in which you request information concerning the utilization of the United Nations in the conflict in Vietnam.

There are a number of roles which the United Nations might conceivably play in the Vietnam situation, among which are the provision of peacekeeping forces, a channel for diplomatic discussions, a forum for negotiations, and a coordinator of regional economic development. It is important to assess the practicability of these roles both in conjunction with movement toward a peaceful settlement and in relation to the attitudes of Hanoi and Peiping toward U.N. involvement. The United States has attempted more than once to use United Nations machinery to help resolve various aspects of the Vietnam situation. Unfortunately, in recent months we have witnessed the contemptuous rejection by Pei-

ping and Hanoi of any U.N. role in the Vietnam situation and of one proposal after another to move the Vietnam situation to the conference table.

In May 1964, Cambodia complained to the United Nations Security Council of South Vietnamese military incursions into Cambodian territory. At that time, the United States and the Republic of Vietnam suggested several variants of a U.N. peacekeeping body which might be established on the border. The Security Council sent a mission of three of its members (Brazil, Ivory Coast, and Morocco) to examine the border situation and make recommendations as to how these incidents could be avoided.

Hanoi and Peiping condemned even this limited United Nations initiative in southeast Asia. The Vietcong warned that they could not guarantee the safety of the Mission that would not accept its findings. South Vietnam welcomed the Mission and noted that the incidents resulted only from the Government's defensive actions against Vietcong military activities in the border area. Cambodia ultimately rejected the Mission's report and recommendations to the Security Council.

In August 1964, the United States requested a meeting of the Security Council to consider the serious situation created by the North Vietnamese torpedo boat attacks on two U.S. destroyers in international waters. In accordance with article 51 of the United Nations Charter, the United States reported the defensive measures it had taken in response to these attacks. The Council invited both North and South Vietnam to provide such information relating to this issue as they desired to make available, either by taking part in the Council's discussions or in a form they might otherwise prefer. The Republic of Vietnam expressed its readiness to offer the Security Council its full cooperation. However, the North Vietnamese maintained that the Security Council "has no right to examine the problem" and replied that any illegal decision on the U.S. complaint by the Security Council would be considered null and void by the North Vietnamese authorities.

In early April 1965, there were press reports that UN Secretary-General U Thant had offered to visit several capitals of the world to discuss the Vietnam situation. In Peiping, the official People's Daily editorialized: "Mr. Thant wants to come to China and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to seek a settlement of the Vietnam question. Obviously, he is knocking at the wrong door . . . the Vietnam question has nothing to do with the United Nations."

On June 25, 1965, in a speech at San Francisco on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the United Nations, President Lyndon Johnson called upon "this gathering of the nations of the world to use all their influence, individually and collectively, to bring to the table those who seem determined to make war. We will support your efforts, as we support effective action by any agent or agency of these United Nations." On June 29, the People's Daily commentator in a broadcast from Peiping replied to the President's speech by stating again that "the United Nations has nothing to do with the Vietnam question and has no right to intervene in it."

If the Vietnam question were brought before the United Nations at the present time, any proposal to establish a U.N. peacekeeping force or to otherwise assign military responsibility in Vietnam to the United Nations would not receive necessary support among members of the Security Council or the General Assembly in the absence of agreement from the Communist side.

This is not to say, of course, that the United Nations has no value in meeting certain of the problems of southeast Asia. For instance, the Secretary General has indicated his availability as a channel for dis-

cussion of a peaceful solution in Vietnam. We appreciate his suggestions and hope that the channel will remain open.

The United Nations is already deeply involved in international development programs in southeast Asia, with 9 U.N. agencies represented in South Vietnam and 12 U.N. agencies involved in the planning and early operating stages of the Mekong Coordinating Committee. President Johnson, in his speech of April 7 at Johns Hopkins University, expressed the hope that the Secretary General could initiate with the countries of southeast Asia a plan for increased development. The President also pledged \$1 billion in support of this undertaking. Mr. Eugene Black was subsequently designated as the President's Special Representative and has already held consultations with United Nations officials.

Nor do we exclude the possibility that if, as, and when there is a peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam, the United Nations might well sponsor peacekeeping machinery which could be useful in assuring that all parties kept faith with that settlement.

I hope that this information will prove helpful to you and that you will write again if we may be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional
Relations.

Adlai Stevenson: Advocate of Freedom,
Citizen of the World

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1965

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we are joined today in universal sorrow at the death of one of the free world's greatest citizens.

Adlai Ewing Stevenson was a man of consummate grace and intelligence.

He became a spokesman for the Democratic Party at a time when our party needed an eloquent voice. No man could have given more dutifully of his personal energies.

Somehow those years seem far, far away in our history.

We say them, now, and they almost have the ring of another century. Nineteen hundred and fifty-two was a time of great transition and grave change. Nineteen hundred and fifty-six brought us nearer the threshold of the dream of peace we hold forever as part of our democratic system.

How thankful we should be, now—how grateful we should have been, then—for that single, lonely voice that spoke to us in the midst of our complacency.

He came to the platform in Chicago on July 26, 1952. The harsh lights of the television crews and the exploding flashbulbs did not flatter his receding hairline; they put an added highlight in his eyes; they made him seem a little older, a trifle smaller in stature, a good deal more subject to caricature than he really was.

And then he spoke these words:

Let's talk sense to the American people. Let's tell them the truth, that there are no gains without pains, that this is the eve of

great decisions, not easy decisions, like resistance when you're attacked, but a long, patient, costly struggle which alone can assure triumph over the great enemies of men—war and poverty and tyranny—and the assaults upon human dignity which are the most grievous consequences of each.

Few people in his audience had ever been exposed to an orator like Governor Stevenson. His voice was clipped and measured; it had none of the florid, flowing effusiveness of the old-fashioned political speaker.

It was the voice of a teacher who loved children.

It was the voice of sanity and reason. It was the voice of rational, intelligent dissent.

The level of American political debate was elevated immeasurably by that one speech. It grew and matured with each new one he gave during the course of that ill-fated campaign.

No man in our modern history presented a more complex and varied personality to his listeners.

He was a man of culture and we should be proud, as a people, that he was, for he brought a new dignity, a new public notice to the intellectual that a climate of fear had stifled and denied him.

The sum of a man's life is counted in many things.

Adlai Stevenson was a great speaker. He was an accomplished writer. He was a genuine and witty commentator on his country, its minor foibles and its occasionally pretentious politicians.

More than everything else, he was a true American patriot.

In New York City in August 1952, he gave this definition of his own ideal kind of patriotism when he said:

A patriotism that puts country ahead of self; a patriotism which is not short, frenzied outbursts of emotion, but the tranquil and steady dedication of a lifetime.

When an American says that he loves his country, he means not only that he loves the New England hills, the prairies glistening in the sun, the wide and rising plains, the great mountains, and the sea. He means that he loves an inner air, an inner light in which freedom lives and in which a man can draw the breath of self-respect.

No man since Thomas Jefferson has so clearly enunciated a meaning for personal patriotism.

No man of modern times has more definitively lived up to his own aspirations.

Adlai Stevenson truly lived a life of tranquil and steady dedication to America's cause and America's people.

Many of us drew strength and inspiration from him.

We have a lifetime of memories and a lot more self-respect to show for that.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Public Law 90 of the 83th

Congress, President Johnson has declared this week as Captive Nations Week.

Every year since 1959, the Congress has paused in its deliberations to consider the tragedy of those nations who have been swallowed up by Communist imperialism. Today, no less than 180 million of our fellow human beings are prisoners of the Soviet system.

We in the 14th District of New Jersey are fortunate to have as neighbors many fine American citizens who are fugitives from Soviet oppression. I use the word "fortunate" because those who know slavery and tyranny firsthand are the most vigorous supporters of freedom and the dignity of man. No foreign invader has violated continental United States since 1815 and no native American now living has had to exist under the conqueror's heel. We who were born in this great Nation have an unfortunate tendency to take the blessings of liberty too lightly. This is not so with those who know firsthand what it is to live in a police state with the ever-present dread of the midnight visit by the secret police. To these newer Americans, freedom is a cherished thing and they bring to these shores a love of liberty which is an inspiration to all Americans.

On this seventh observance of Captive Nations Week there is little encouragement we can give to those whose fortune it has been to be imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain. But we do know that in God's time the Poles, the Czechs, the Hungarians, the Rumanians, the Ukrainians, the Latvians, the Lithuanians, the Estonians, the Albanians, the North Koreans, the North Vietnamese, and all the other prisoners of international communism will know what it is to step out of the shadows of slavery into the bright sunlight of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, it is a solemn duty for us to continue to press for the liberation of all captive nations. Let us pray that before too many of these observances have passed we may see these captive nations taking their rightful places among the truly sovereign peoples of the world. It is vital that we always keep the cause of self-determination for all nations constantly before us. We must never—even for a moment—allow ourselves to forget the cause of those who are denied the most basic of freedoms.

Time for Government Action To Halt Crime in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days J. Edgar Hoover will release the crime report for the United States in 1964. We are certain to learn from this report that the crime rate has increased in the last year over 1963.

We now know that since 1958 crime has increased six times faster than our

population growth. This, to me, is alarming, and something must be done.

Something that can be done immediately is the calling of a White House Conference on Crime Prevention and Juvenile Delinquency. In February, I introduced House Joint Resolution 321 calling for such a White House Conference, which would bring together the creative thinking of law enforcement officers, teachers, State and local officials for the purpose of adopting a program of crime prevention to rid the country of this No. 1 domestic problem. The problem of educating our children is the problem of teaching them to live good lives, and we must do something about it by cutting down the crime rate.

A provocative editorial in the July 19, 1965, Jacksonville, Fla., Journal calls for action on the Federal, State, and local levels to make our cities and towns safe places in which to live, and I commend it to your attention. The first step needed is to gather our best minds in the field together to work out a plan of concrete action, and I urge the Congress to adopt my resolution for a White House Conference on Crime Prevention and Juvenile Delinquency. The editorial follows:

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal, July 19, 1965]

A CIVIL RIGHT

Recent news stories of brutal killings and attacks throughout the Nation, including the murders here in Jacksonville of a shoe store owner and a 14-year-old boy, put new emphasis on the mounting problem of crime.

President Johnson is said to be seriously considering the appointment of a special crime commission for Washington, which has become a cesspool of muggers, rapists, and murderers.

This Commission would recommend measures for better law enforcement in the Capital and presumably work with the existing agencies.

It is apparent that the time has come for some sort of reinforced police action in Washington, New York, and the other "melting pot" cities throughout the country. But it is also a growing problem in cities such as Jacksonville.

The Tampa Tribune last week reported a story illustrating the contrast in American crime and that of European countries.

A college girl, just returned from a tour of Europe, was asked how she and three companions had existed on such a modest budget during their trip. She explained that the four of them had toured by a camper-bus in which they rode by day and slept by night. For sleeping purposes at the end of the day, she said, they merely pulled off the road anywhere they chose.

She was asked if four girls would have dared sleeping in a camper by the roadside in this country. The girl assured her interviewer that they couldn't think of such a thing. In Europe, she said, they had no fear of criminal attack.

Other stories seem to bear this out. People don't fear to stroll along the streets and rivers at night in Europe. It is getting to the place where they would be crazy to do it over here.

We submit that crime in this country has reached the place where its correction and prevention should take precedent over any domestic issue now pending.

Civil rights is the great political expediency of our time. It has the most effective lobbyists ever known in the history of our Congress. But isn't the safety of the lives of all decent Americans just as much a civil right?

July 22, 1965

A3969

It is historically anomalous that the State of North Carolina, which refused to ratify the Constitution of the United States, until after its leaders, in line with Jefferson's strategy, were given assurance that at the earliest opportunity the Bill of Rights would be made a basic part of the Constitution is the very State which adopted a "gag law" in violation of the Bill of Rights. To her shame, as an educational, agricultural, industrial, and humane leader of the risen South, North Carolina now has a statute which constitutes a political interference with the responsibility of the boards of trustees of the university and the State colleges for the responsible intellectual freedom and moral autonomy of the State's educational institutions as basic parts of the human liberties of our free society.

There will be a continuing rallying of not only almost all the newspapers, the presidents and chancellors, the faculties, students, the alumni, and alumnae, not only of the State institutions, but also of the church-related colleges, as boldly expressed, for example, by Wake Forest, and Davidson, and of the privately endowed national Duke University, as eloquently voiced at Chapel Hill by president Douglas M. Knight, in moral support of the responsible freedom of all our colleges and universities.

As in the past, when basic liberties and far-visioned State undertakings were in issue, so again there will surely be organized a statewide movement of the people of North Carolina, rolling on in gathering power from the mountains to the sea, to redeem and refurbish her great name, and, in this case, to bring to an end this misrepresentative reaction against our American heritage and this violation of the American Bill of Rights, which North Carolina had a part in making one of the foundations of the greatness of a free America and, in turn, the United States had a part, under the leadership of a noble American woman, in making a part of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, June 30, 1965]
SOME SAGE COUNSEL FOR THE U. OF A.

North Carolina has a well earned reputation as the most progressive of the Southern States and yet it is afflicted with one of the worst State laws constricting academic freedom. This law is under attack by North Carolina educators and newspapers, among others, and the issue is essentially the same as one that has been stirring debate in Arkansas.

The offending North Carolina statute prohibits speaking appearances by Communists or fifth amendment pleaders at any State institution. Blessedly, Arkansas has no such statute but, on the record of University of Arkansas policy, the absence of such statutory prohibition may be of no immediate import. In the celebrated affair of the visiting Bulgarian, the use of a university facility was denied a foreign governmental attaché who had been invited by a student group to speak. The reason for denial was the visitor's membership in the Communist Party. Later the University of Arkansas, in another disputed decision, sought to block a speaking appearance by a leader of the California student protest movement. Against this background we have no doubt that the Fayetteville policy would embrace North Carolina's preclusion of fifth amendment pleaders or almost any other class of controversial speakers.

Many of us in Arkansas and elsewhere have argued the case for academic freedom, but we doubt if anyone has presented the case more clearly and eloquently than has Frank Graham, distinguished North Carolina educator, in remarks that we published yesterday in the columns across from the editorial page. Mr. Graham, former president

of the University of North Carolina and former U.S. Senator, has been a key figure in bringing his university to national eminence. His credentials are the finest, and his logic is unassailable, as in this excerpt from his remarks (made in a talk at Manteo, N.C.), which we commend to the University of Arkansas president and board of trustees:

"The issue here is not the employment of a teacher who is a member of a party whose line automatically shifts with orders from above, contrary to the principles of academic freedom, the open forum, and the American Bill of Rights. Rather the issue is the right of a responsible faculty and student committee to invite speakers to open forums for hearing all points of view, including the extreme right, conservative, liberal, moderate, and the extreme left, all subject to cross-examination and reply. Such open forums are a part of the educational process for equipping students for understanding our own democracy and for informed grappling with the problems of the present age.

"Such open forums, also, are of the very substance of academic freedom, our historic civil liberties and the American Bill of Rights. The free market of ideas in this historic American view is a basic part of the American tradition of free enterprise. Gag laws repressing the freedom of assembly and speech are expressions of the totalitarian way and are contrary to the American way * * *"

Joe (Tom) McVicker
The Sows, Seed, and Cement War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, our newspapers are filled each day with stories of the fighting in Vietnam. Behind these headlines, however, is a remarkable story of progress on other fronts.

The following first-hand account by a woman who knows Vietnam well is a poignant story of what our foreign aid representatives and private American organizations are accomplishing behind the battlelines. It is a description of another war against the poverty and hunger of a people who have known little else than war.

Mrs. Werner J. Blanchard, the author of this article which appeared recently in Presbyterian Life, has just finished 2 years in the Peace Corps, where she was a volunteer teacher in the Philippines. A member of the United Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, Juliet Blanchard is a writer and world traveler.

The article follows:

THE SOWS, SEED, AND CEMENT WAR IN VIETNAM

"This war is not lost." The big, balding American pounded his fist on the rail of the pigpen. Hugging an enormous cauliflower under his arm, he munched on a handful of peanuts grown and seasoned by Vietnamese farm women.

"Pigs," he said, "that's how we'll win it. We imported 150,000, gave 2 piglets to a farmer, and a boar to each hamlet. A farmer can make 7,000 piasters a year with pigs,

more than the value of his whole rice crop. And he won't stand for the Vietcong stealing 'em." The sow rolled over on her clean fat side and grunted contentedly with a Kansas drawl.

That's the seldom-told story of the war in Vietnam: a farmer will fight for his pigs. That was the reason for the Agricultural Extension Prize Award ceremony at Bien Hoa village. On the grandstand, decked with bright yellow, red-banded flags of Vietnam flapping in the warm winter sun, sat national, local, and foreign officials. Several hundred farmers and their families faced them silently while plump brown babies in shirts and no pants played on the grass.

The Minister of Rural Affairs spoke at the microphone. "I am very much moved at seeing our compatriots of all social classes gathering so numerously as such; and I am sincerely grateful * * *". The written English translation handed to guests continued, but the speaker's voice was lost in the roar of planes from Bien Hoa military airport. The minister waited, aware, as was his audience, that the sounds of security take precedence over all other sounds in this country.

The shooting war in Vietnam we know well. From a comfortable distance of 10,000 miles we are mildly concerned with the fate of people we scarcely know, in a country we cannot visualize, one with which before 1945 we had little trade or political connection. We are deeply distressed at finding ourselves involved in a cause with no assurance of success, fighting alongside people who do not seem to be sure what they want, people without a clearcut conception of freedom, who lack stable institution of representative government.

In January 1965, the news seemed to indicate near collapse of the country, and I felt constrained to make my third trip to Vietnam to see for myself what civilian life under siege was like, and how Vietnamese friends and American advisers felt about the situation.

That's how I happened to be present at the agricultural fair, reading the minister's speech as he continued: "As all of us know, Vietnam is an agricultural country where 80 percent of its citizens are farmers. The Government is convinced that most of the farmers are living under the Vietcong everyday direct menace, both at the material and mental viewpoints. Consequently, the Government is confident that in order to defeat the Vietcong, it must conquer the rural people's feeling and consider the countryside as a base for our work of national salvation and reconstruction."

The people didn't seem much impressed by this policy statement, but they did understand the awarding of prizes. Pigs and poultry were presented to outstanding farmers by local officials and by American and Chinese (Taiwan) advisers. Bags of fertilizer, cement, insecticide, and sprayers were gifts from notables and industrialists.

On exhibit were results of crop improvement and diversification: thin, tender sugarcane, cassia, cauliflowerer, corn, peanuts, onions, ginger root, and improved varieties of rice. Youngsters proudly demonstrated care of animals under a familiar green and white flag on which 4-T had replaced the 4-H which American agricultural experts have introduced around the world.

As the formalities came to an end, we drove back toward Saigon along the edge of the airport where only a few weeks before the Vietcong had launched a surprise attack, destroying half the aircraft.

"This area isn't exactly secure, is it?" I asked Vladimir Lehovich of U.S. Operations Mission (USOM, our economic-assistance program).

"Not exactly," he replied politely, exhibiting no amusement at my ignorance which assumed that civilians stayed out of Vietcong territory. I was to learn that this war looks less like a patchwork quilt than a

July 22, 1965

sleeve, with fluid seeping in and out, and neither side able to strain the other entirely out of any area.

"But the Government of Vietnam has better control here than in many areas," the tall young man from New York City went on to explain, "because there are a lot of resettled refugees from the north. They are the backbone of counterinsurgency. They know what they are fighting against."

"And for," added the pig expert.

The agricultural fair and the airport together illustrate the two-pronged objectives of U.S. policy in Vietnam, and the reason for our presence there in response to requests repeated by consecutive governments: First, counterinsurgency to defeat the Communist offensive; second, nation building or the development of an economic and social structure which will improve relations between the Government of Vietnam and its citizens and eventually enable the country to be self-sufficient. Programs directed to the two objectives are not only intertwined; they are inseparable.

Before the recently stepped-up military offensive, over half of our aid was for economic and social purposes. Examples of these various kinds of assistance and of the coordination of counterinsurgency and local development work can be seen well in the province of Tay Ninh. Here nation building is going on right in the midst of Vietcong territory. The capital city of Tay Ninh is a 20-minute flight west from Saigon and lies within a few miles of the jungle headquarters of the Vietcong. Tourists do not fly to Tay Ninh these days to see the fantastic temples of the Cau Dai religious sect which combines the teachings of Buddha, Moses, Christ, and Confucius. But the airport, fortunately near the center of town, is busy with helicopters, cargo planes, and small craft which deposit their business passengers and return quickly to the relative safety of Saigon.

Affairs in the province are administered by the Province Chief, the commander of Vietnamese military forces, working closely with the representative of USOM and a team of the Military Advisory Command in Vietnam (MACV, pronounced "MacVee"). Eduardo Navarro, Filipino-American citizen, our province representative, is concerned with the welfare of the 250,000 inhabitants. As a retired colonel in the U.S. Army, he has a soldier's respect for discipline.

"What makes people fight?" he asked a group of civilians and soldiers. "What makes men go forward into danger? Quiet, peaceful people who only want to be left alone? It's either tough discipline—which these raw troops don't have—or it's strong motivation, that's what parents have for the school they build with their own hands. The Vietcong promise schools. We build them." Frankly he puts more faith in his PTA "troops" than in the Vietnamese local militia.

Mr. Navarro and the province chief are proud of over 100 "unfunded" schools which have been built without outside financing except for cement and roofing supplied by the United States.

We watched the PTA members building. Mothers in black trousers, short Chinese-style overblouses, and conical hats carried wet cement in skin buckets on a pole slung over the shoulder to fathers who laid a wall of single bricks. They smiled at us as they worked in the tropical sun. Across the field came the sound of children's voices chanting their lessons in other classrooms built with U.S. assistance. Their teachers were some of the 198 who have recently been trained. It is easier to get teachers to take training now that the pay has been raised to about \$150 a year, which is considered a living wage. American assistance is also given to private schools and orphanages.

Health services include a new surgical wing at the province hospital, staffed with a team of 15 Filipino doctors, nurses, and technicians paid by the Republic of the Philippines. Malaria eradication, well on its way before 1960, has been seriously hampered by the Vietcong, but clinics stocked with U.S. pharmaceutical supplies serve the local needs.

While lunching with the province chief, Mr. Navarro received word that one of his Jeeps had been ambushed by the Vietcong, but the driver got away. "Those blank Vietcong," he exploded. "We've got to get right out there and tell the people the medical supplies on that Jeep were from their government before the Vietcong distributes them as their own good deed." He sighed, "Who will they believe?"

That's just one of the unanswered questions in this strange, mixed-up contest for the loyalties of peasants who have never been disturbed by political ideologies or the surge of nationalism, and who merely want to raise their rice and their children in peace, with as little regulation and taxation as possible. The greatest desire of these people is for land. A sound program of land reform was begun under Diem, similar to that which has been so successful in Taiwan, whereby farmers can buy the land they till over a 7-year period, and landlords receive some recompense. But this is poor competition against the Vietcong, who simply kill the landlord and tell the peasants to take the land.

The province chief seemed optimistic, nevertheless, as he explained the development program by which it is hoped to get or keep the hamlets out of Vietcong control by assuring security and helping the people achieve a life worth fighting for. This is called the new life hamlet program. It attempts to salvage something from the strategic hamlets of the Diem regime. That grandiose scheme, promoted by Ngo Dinh Nhu, was supposed to relocate peasants in thousands of hamlets which were defensible. But the double fences of barbed wire or crisscrossed sharpened posts, which I saw on the road to Dalat, gave no protection against the modern weapons increasingly used by the Vietcong. The local defense forces and the embryonic councils were easily infiltrated by the Vietcong, and a hamlet could be subverted at will by the simple expedient of murdering the officials, doctors, and teachers, and threatening the leaderless people with similar treatment. If they resisted, the hamlet was burned; the able-bodied men were kidnapped or "persuaded" to join the Vietcong.

Now the Vietnamese American advisers, both civilian and military, work together to build communities one by one. In the Tay Ninh area, 21 of the 109 hamlets are considered "new life" and secure. They have the beginnings of local government. Self-help projects, such as markets, roads, schools, and clinics, are encouraged by U.S. supplies of dried milk, bulgar wheat, corn meal, oil, and other items in our Public Law 480, or surplus commodity, program. An essential part of the general plan is the routing out of Vietcong agents who can only be identified by the local people.

It is a painfully slow, often discouraging process, seriously hampered by lack of trained and dependable public officials and police. The Vietcong began their offensive before 1959 by assassinating 10,000 local officials. The country has never recovered from that blow to orderly and effective government. In fact, it is easy to feel that this attempt to build a country while under attack is impossible, but the attitude of Americans on the spot is "when have we retreated from the impossible?"

From technicians, specialists, and advisers of every kind one hears, "This can be a great country—if we only had security" or "We'll be here a long time." Or, "No matter how it looks from the United States, we are laying the foundation for the future of a people." And in a chorus, "We're sticking." I didn't find one single person who wanted to come home. Certainly no one with a spark of compassion would of his own will walk out on harassed, desperate, bewildered people who have known no peace for 20 years, who fought the Japanese, fought the French, and are fighting their own people for the right to choose how they shall live.

This feeling was reflected by the wives of Americans right up to the moment they were brought home. In Saigon these women gave me a whirlwind tour of welfare institutions where they were giving service and financial aid. Mrs. William Westmoreland, wife of the commanding general of MACV, not only served personally in the hospitals, but trained hundreds of Vietnamese women in "Gray Lady" work which was an entirely new idea to them. At the Caritas Home for the Undernourished Children in a building built and equipped by the American Women's Association, Eleanor Elson Heglinbotham, daughter of the pastor of the National Presbyterian Church in Washington, D.C., discussed Vietnamese needs with nurses in French. Most Americans in our agencies in Vietnam speak either French or Vietnamese. Elly's husband, Erland, is in the economic section of USOM. His parents, themselves in Government service overseas are both active Presbyterians. There are many others with similar background and motivation, and we can be proud of the kind of people who are serving in Vietnam with dedication and a buoyant goodwill. There is no Peace Corps there, for the country is considered too dangerous, but a large corps of young men in International Voluntary Service (a private church-initiated organization under Government contract) is giving valuable assistance in remote areas.

Our economic assistance to Vietnam for 10 years has been not merely anti-Communist, but rather primarily propeople, and it covers the whole spectrum of the everlasting war on poverty, disease, ignorance. Evidence is widespread: wells and water tanks, toilets and insecticides, training for doctors, teachers, police. Most recent are the beginnings of basic industries such as textiles, roofing, cement, and sericulture (the production of silk).

A war cannot be won by compassionate civilians with sows, seed, and cement. But this war cannot be won without them. The use of these kinds of weapons is too little, but it is not too late. If we could find courageous personnel and part with the funds, it could be multiplied many times. The Government of Vietnam might be persuaded to distribute land much faster, on easier terms. And the proposals, coming from many sources, that the mammoth development of the Mekong River region be rapidly stepped up might be an inducement to the nations of that region torn by strife and hatred to cooperate for their own collective interests.

But none of these possibilities can become realities until aggression by mass terror is stopped. For a long time responsible Vietnamese insisted that the only way to do this was to attack the source of control and supplies in Ho Chi Minh territory. Now this is taking place, and peace-seeking Americans are divided between enthusiastic support, violent opposition, and doubts. We face the terrible choice: by bombing we risk immediate widening of the conflict; by not bombing we risk uncontrollable spread of creeping aggression.

July 22, 1965

A3971

Avoiding arguments on strategy, senseless name calling, all-or-nothing demands, academic solutions, or facesaving devices, as Christians and responsible citizens, we want to know whether our effort is justified. If we believe that freedom is a God-given right for all men, must we not fan its flame, however weak, wherever it is possible to do so?

Being practical people, we want to know whether our cause has a chance to succeed in Vietnam. In trying to see our way clear in this situation, it would help if we had a more complete picture of the people we are fighting and working with. Granting the information we get is true, it should be balanced with less known but no less valid facts. For instance, to have some perspective on student opinion, we should know not only that students sometimes break windows in the Abraham Lincoln Library in Saigon, but that inside the library the seats are filled with students of all ages taking advantage of books, films, displays, and English classes. It is worth noting that in the traffic circle in front of that library a huge billboard showed the progress of the campaign for flood relief with the flags of 27 nations which were helping, and that the students were stopping cars as they entered the city to collect contributions for flood victims.

When we feel that we are alone in support of South Vietnam and are incurring ill will of other countries in so doing, we should know that 24 other nations, including Japan, Taiwan, Thailand, the Philippines, Korea, and Australia are assisting with supplies and personnel.

The picture of villagers sullen and unappreciative "of all we have done for them" should be accompanied by a picture of children bowing over folded arms to Americans who are supplying basic needs, and by many pictures of Americans moving freely in the back country in immediate danger of ambush, kidnaping, death by the Vietcong, but trusting the people with whom they work to protect them.

For those who claim that Vietnamese don't care about freedom, do not even know its meaning, and are not worth fighting for, I covet the friendship of just one of the uncounted Vietnamese who do care, like Vu Ngoc Dai. Dai is a Catholic whose mother was killed and whose father died during the Communist revolution in the North. He teaches economic and political science in three high schools in Saigon and was a UNESCO scholar at the University of the Philippines, where I helped him with English. He adopted me as his foster mother, and my family was suddenly enlarged by a delightful and devoted son, daughter-in-law, and two loving grandchildren—another is expected soon. In our conversations we probed the meanings of freedom, dictatorship, and communism. When Dai returned to Saigon, he refused to cooperate with the Diem regime, knowing well the risks to himself and to his family. His first question the last time he met me was, "Ma'am, are the Americans going to get out?"

"Not as long as you want us to stay," I replied.

A moment of tense silence and then, quietly, "I have escaped the Communists twice; now there is no place else to go. The Americans are our only hope. I must leave my students and go into battle."

Back at the agricultural ceremony, the country woman, with a face like tooled leather, bowed over her folded hands, thanking the officials who were presenting her with a pig in a crate. When she lifted her eyes, they were dulled by the years of struggle, disaster, and terror she had known, but she must have been clinging to a small hope—that the pig would live to grow up and be food for her family.

"It's What's Happening, Baby"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1965

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter from one of my younger constituents, which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues:

JULY 5, 1965.

Representative LAURENCE J. BURTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BURTON: I am writing for two reasons. First, to thank you for "The American Creed" that I received at the time of my graduation, and second, to ask you if you have seen the CBS report, "It's What's Happening, Baby?" This report, I understand, was geared for kids between the ages of 16 and 22. I tuned in to this program in hopes of finding a job, Sunday, July 4, at 10:30 p.m. But to my dismay I found that Youth Corp opportunities were only open to dropouts and people who were being given second chances because of lack of money and other personal poverty reasons. I would like to know if this program was paid for by the taxpayers' hard-earned money, because if it was, I would like to protest and say that my father, although not a poverty victim or a welfare dependent, finds the way to support seven children and a wife.

I also attended the youth opportunity conference, on Wednesday, June 30, from 9 a.m. to 12 p.m., held at Weber State College. I know that all the kids that attended this conference were not dropouts, but now because of this conference wish they had quit school instead of finding determination in overcoming difficulties to attain the high school diploma. To add to my disgust, the entertainment furnished by the sponsors of this gathering were degraded delinquents dressed in skintight pants, dirty sweat-shirts, and long, unkempt hair. Their actions, to me, conveyed immoral ideas and thoughts. They called themselves "The Wild Ones," and in this one area I agreed with them. Their instruments were turned on full and they screamed to get attention. People who didn't want to listen or wanted to talk had to grin and bear it until they rested. For 3 hours I listened to men tell the teenage dropout what a bright future he had in store. The high school graduate was never mentioned once and when questions were asked pertaining to the graduate, the questions were unheeded because of lack of information.

Now to get back to my previous complaint about the show, "It's What's Happening, Baby." I found this 90-minute program to be a waste of time for everyone except the slum victim or the poverty-ridden dropout. What happens to the graduate looking for work who is confronted with dropouts who are also looking for job opportunities but didn't have the incentive to stay in school and finish? How can the graduate further his education without money or the job experience he needs? Where can he go? The employment agency has plenty of jobs but these jobs are for the experienced person and not a young educated person. On this CBS report were rock-and-roll artists who had received fame since the Beatles made their debut. Among them were: Herman's Hermits, the Four Tops, the Miracles, the Su-

premes, Gary Lewis and the Playboys, Dave Clark Five, the Cannibals, the Headhunters, the Righteous Brothers, and Jan and Dean, just to name a few. The jerk was portrayed by dancers who seemed as though they had just received a fix or a goofball. It seemed we had reduced ourselves to the animal stage, and at one scene, the dancers were looking out of cages in a zoo and this, I feel, is just where they belong.

What are your views on the subject?

Sincerely yours,

MISS MARIECHEN NELSON.

OGDEN, UTAH.

Protecting Our Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are proud of the accomplishments of organized labor. They are proud, too, of the things labor stands for. One cause which America's trade unions have supported over the years is the protection of our natural resources.

We have reached a critical point in American history today. There is a dangerously diminishing amount of land and water available for outdoor recreation, while the demand is rapidly growing.

Last week, the United Auto Workers testified in support of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in a subcommittee of the other body, which approved a similar bill in the last Congress. The House of Representatives, I trust, will soon act on this legislation. I sincerely hope we can conclude action on this most worthwhile legislation in the 89th Congress.

Labor's interest in conservation is not something which happened overnight. Several important statements by leading exponents of labor on conservation have been uttered which deserve the attention of House Members.

During the White House Conference on Natural Beauty in Washington earlier this year, the UAW president, Mr. Walter P. Reuther, rose from the audience in a panel discussion on "townscaping" or "making cities better places to live in" and said things which captured the imagination of all who heard them.

Many Members have received copies of an attractive booklet called "In Pursuit of Greatness" which contains major portions of President Johnson's message to Congress on natural beauty. This handsome booklet was prepared as a public service by the United Auto Workers and contains a most thoughtful foreword by Mr. Reuther.

Labor has no special ax to grind on conservation. What organized labor does to win approval of more parks will add nothing to the paychecks of its members. It does mean much to the great multitude of Americans who thirst for a

A3972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 22, 1965

place to relax and partake of the beauties of nature.

For these reasons I insert Mr. Reuther's statement to the White House Conference on Natural Beauty, the AFL-CIO Executive Council statement on "Enhancing Our Living Environment," and Mr. Reuther's foreword to the booklet "In Pursuit of Greatness" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, "ENHANCING OUR LIVING ENVIRONMENT," BAL HARBOUR, FLA., MARCH 1, 1965

President Johnson's special message to Congress on natural beauty is in the mainstream of progressive American efforts throughout our history to develop our natural resources and enhance our living environment. Its stress on the beauty and wholesomeness of our surroundings gives it an essential place on the agenda of public and private actions that must be taken to realize the Great Society, since such a society must sustain the spirit as well as concern itself with the material well-being of its citizens.

The President's message has the special merit and urgency of calling for a "new conservation" concerned not with nature alone but with "the total relation between man and the world around him." Within that broad context, it comes to grips with what the President calls "the darker side" of the new technology; the threats to life, health, and enjoyment of its uncontrolled or inadequately controlled waste products; it calls for priority attention to the needs of a growing population increasingly concentrated in metropolitan areas; and it goes beyond a superficial cosmetic approach to call for the introduction of "a conscious and active concern for the values of beauty" into "all our planning, our programs, our building, and our growth."

We support the President's intent—to be implemented where necessary through specific legislative requests in the near future—to beautify our system of roads and highways, to improve and extend our network of scenic roads and parkways, and to undertake a cooperative Federal-State-local program to create a national system of trails for walking, horseback riding, and cycling. This program will serve the three-fold purpose of enhancing the beauty of our environment, rendering highway travel less monotonous and dangerous, and contributing significantly to the volume of employment.

We welcome the President's proposal for broadening the open-space program to permit grants to help city governments acquire and clear areas to create small parks, squares, pedestrian malls, and playgrounds; and we support his request for authority for a matching program for installation of outdoor lights and benches and creation of attractive cityscapes along roads and in business areas.

We strongly support the President's intention to expand our present system of parks, seashores, and recreation areas to meet the growing needs of expanding population.

We call for prompt enactment of the water pollution control bill (passed by the Senate as S. 4) to expand Federal water pollution control activities, in line with the President's recommendations.

With respect to air pollution, we call for prompt congressional action to strengthen the Clean Air Act in line with the President's recommendation that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be given authority to investigate potential air-pollution problems before pollution occurs, and to make recommendations for prevention.

We stress the importance of the President's allocation of additional funds in the

budget to assure greater knowledge and control of pesticides and his request for additional funds for the Department of Agriculture for research into a regulatory control over toxic chemicals. We favor the intent of legislation being prepared in the Department of Agriculture for tightening control over the manufacture and use of agricultural chemicals, including, the President reports, "licensing and factory inspection of manufacturers, clearly placing the burden of proof of safety on the proponent of the chemical rather than on the Government."

The AFL-CIO will cooperate with the Government and join with all concerned groups in undertaking what the President terms "the large campaign of public education which is needed to alert Americans to the danger to their natural heritage and to the need for action."

STATEMENT BY WALTER P. REUTHER AT WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON NATURAL BEAUTY, 1965

I am Walter Reuther, and I am here as president of the United Automobile Workers and also chairman of my neighborhood conservation and beautification committee. I had the privilege of hearing President Johnson's inspiring address at the University of Michigan when he called upon Americans to join in the building of the Great Society. I was most impressed when he said, "As members of that great society, we would need to be more concerned with the quality of our goals than the quantity of our goods." That is what this Conference is about.

This Conference is about how a free society, within its value system, can harness the rising star of science and technology to provide the higher and higher levels of economic abundance, but also use that abundance consistent with basic human values to satisfy both man's material needs and the needs of the human spirit.

To me, this Conference is about how we build a tomorrow in which we can have not only more bread, but also more roses. Satisfying our material needs is a very simple thing with our advanced technology, but if we stand committed almost exclusively to the expansion of man's material well-being and neglect his spiritual well-being, then I think we will fail to achieve that Great Society.

What is our basic problem? As I see it, it is summarized in the remarks you made, Mr. Chairman. You said because a sewer collapsed in Philadelphia you had an opportunity to build a garden path and you wanted to make that garden path the way garden paths should be, with flagstones and with nature. Instead of that, you got blacktop.

Why is it that we get unlimited blacktop. It is because we have limited budgets. We have limited budgets because we give lip-service to our value system, but we are not acting true to those values.

If we are to build an America in which bread and roses can be achieved in their proper balance, not in the lives of a few, but in the lives of many, then we have a practical job of raising the level of understanding of these intangible, human values that we associate with beauty.

The problem is not that we lack the know-how. We have plenty of know-how. We have plenty of resources.

Our problem is that we have not as a nation, accepted these values and prepared to commit ourselves and our resources to their achievement.

I think we have a tremendous job of public education and I hope that as a result of this conference and the great national attention that will be brought to bear upon the problem, that we can mobilize the trade unions and the churches, and the other great organizations. If we do so, public planners, architects, and other people who really deter-

mine the physical environments of our society will respond to the discipline of an aroused public understanding. I believe that this is the key to whether we can build the Great Society in which man can have both bread and roses.

"IN PURSUIT OF GREATNESS," THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON NATURAL BEAUTY

"To protect and restore the natural heritage of a free people."

(Foreword by Walter P. Reuther)

The American heritage of spacious skies and amber waves of grain is rapidly disappearing. In place of America the beautiful, we have a honky-tonk jungle in most American cities and in much of our countryside.

President Lyndon B. Johnson's message to Congress on natural beauty this year is a reminder that precious little time is left to save our land from becoming, as one commentator rightly warned, "God's own junkyard."

If we act quickly and with intelligence and if we commit ourselves and make a national effort equal to the dimensions of the challenge and the opportunity, we can restore America's beauty and have a heritage for future generations worthy of the children of free men.

President Johnson's challenge to beautify America embraces the total of our living environment. He has called upon us for a total national effort to preserve our forests—our primitive cathedrals—to beautify and purify our streams, to replenish and protect our wild life, to expand our park system and preserve our seashores, to enable increasing millions to share the excitement and joy of contact and communion with nature in its primitive strength and its breathtaking beauty. He urges that we work in our urban areas—our own local communities—in our very backyards if we are to make America beautiful. Seventy percent of the American people live in our great urban areas of congestion which require action bolder and broader than the traditional battle lines on conservation.

We must examine the entire suffocating problems of air and water pollution, traffic congestion, population density, urban sprawl, billboard jungles, auto junkyards, unsightly utility poles, and the woeful lack of planning which results in ugliness and a living environment that does offense to man's dignity and is unnatural in his relationship to nature.

The Great Society envisaged by President Johnson is compassionate. People must be free from the bonds of poverty. Man's spirit can then best soar to heights of greatness in a natural, wholesome environment in neighborhoods with trees, parks, playgrounds, grass, clean air, and water.

The 20th century technological revolution has given us the tools of automation and economic abundance with which we can conquer man's ancient enemies—poverty, ignorance, and disease. We can free the human family from material poverty. We must also work to create a living environment of beauty which will liberate man from the spiritual poverty of ugliness and urban light.

We have mastered the scientific, technical, and productive know-how to satisfy man's material needs. We must now make a comparable effort to master the human, social, and moral know-why essential to achieve man's higher purposes and to relate him to nature as he searches for fulfillment.

President Johnson's call to build the Great Society is a society where men are more concerned with the quality of their goals than with the quantity of their goods.

The good life is more than money in the bank, food on the table, and a roof over the head. The good life is also a place for all children to play and breathing space to live in and grow strong in body, mind, and spirit.

July 22, 1965

deposit with Nationwide Charters and Conventions, Inc.

We feel this action by your company should create more goodwill than any like sum spent through any of the media of advertising. This will undoubtedly create for your company a number of grateful, well-satisfied individuals who will always remember and praise World Airways for their integrity and concern for their potential customers and passengers.

May this bread which you have cast on the waters come back cake to you.

Gentlemen, we thank you.

Very truly yours,

F. HARVEY HOWALT.

SMITHCRAFT CORP.,

Chelsea, Mass., June 2, 1965.

Mr. J. E. DALY,

President, World Airways, Inc., Oakland International Airport, Oakland, Calif.

DEAR MR. DALY: Your bank draft in full repayment of the amount which we deposited with Nationwide Charters and Conventions, Inc., as a deposit for our canceled vacation trip was indeed welcomed as well as a surprise.

There are many things that can be said for your organization, but I think that just the fact that I am sending a letter to you to express our extreme gratification will be sufficient. I also feel that the cost to World Airways of \$150,000 will be well made up for in a short time, in the good image I feel certain will be held by all of the people involved in the vacation cancellations.

For myself, personally, I assure you that it will not be forgotten and if at any time our organization sponsors any kind of a trip, you can be assured that World Airways, Inc. will be considered.

Once again, our very sincere appreciation for all your efforts and conclusions in this very unfortunate situation.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. I. BERNSTEIN,
Newton Center, Mass.

DEWEY & O'BRIEN,

Worcester, Mass., May 27, 1965.

E. J. DALY,

President, World Airways, Inc., Oakland International Airport, Oakland, Calif.

DEAR MR. DALY: Thank you for your letter of May 27, which I have received today, together with the enclosed check for \$200, reimbursement for my deposit with Nationwide Charters for their February 1965 Hawaiian tour.

Being a lawyer, I thoroughly understand that there was no obligation of your company to see that this refund was paid in full. I am sure it will create a lot of goodwill for your company, as it has with me.

I do hope in the early future to avail myself of using World Airways.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD F. O'BRIEN.

CALL FOR FEDERAL ACTION ON TRAFFIC SAFETY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues an astounding fact: More Americans have perished as a result of car accidents on the highways and byways of our land than have suffered death in all the wars in which America has fought since our independence—189 years ago. This is an astonishing, almost incredible tragedy, but the statistics speak for themselves. From our War for Independence

through our present struggle in Vietnam, we have lost 972,000 lives. Yet, since the turn of the century, marking the beginning of the auto age, already 1.5 million Americans have been the fatal victims of automobile accidents.

Mr. Speaker, I have long advocated a more active governmental role in encouraging traffic safety. When I was a member of the New York State Senate, I served as chairman of the Joint Legislative Committee on Motor Vehicles. In that capacity, I had the opportunity to study this problem in depth. I am proud to come from a State that has such a fine record in the field of automobile safety. New York was among the first to require seat belts in new cars. Moreover, we have in New York State, one of the finest driver education programs, along with a program of periodic inspection of our cars. But I am speaking today of the dire need for Federal action—so long overdue—to help stop the increase in highway deaths.

So much of the death and injury that results from car travel can be traced to the car itself. Today, our cars may be safer than they were in the past, but are they safe enough? The development of safe automobiles has a long history, which is still continuing, and which has a long way to go. State governments, private study groups, and the automobile industry itself have all made substantial contributions, but the problem of safety on the highways perdures.

We must realize the tremendous role that the automobile plays in American life. The car is supreme as our most popular means of travel. Let us take the case of people who make overnight trips or travel to points at least 100 miles from home. Eighty-nine percent of them travel by car. One of the most frequent trips people make is between 50 and 100 miles from home, and 95 percent of these travelers go by automobile. The most frequent trip of a day or more is between 100 and 200 miles; 93 percent of the people making this jaunt use cars. The car is also of great use to commuters and 82 percent of them get to work by means of an automobile. Moreover, the part that the automobile plays in American life is growing by leaps and bounds. In 1963 motor vehicles, including passenger cars, buses, and trucks, traveled 801 billion miles. In 1964 this figure jumped to 838 billion—an increase of over 4 percent. Yet, highway traffic deaths in 1964 increased 9 percent over 1963. The ratio of deaths to miles of vehicle travel has been increasing for the past 5 years. It is simply becoming more and more dangerous to drive. Were I to take a trip to California, I would much prefer the safety of a suborbital rocket than the human death chamber that the car has become.

Not only is automobile usage increasing, but the car is becoming more and more a means of interstate travel. While at the present, roughly 10 percent of vehicle mileage is on the Interstate Highway System, by 1975 cars, buses, and trucks will cover 25 percent of their distances on this Interstate network.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no

doubt as to the interstate nature of automobile travel. Of course, we must have effective State laws, but if ever there is an interstate instrument it is the automobile, and there should be no question of Federal authority in this field.

The automobile industry has failed to provide new and better safety devices in cars. The industry spokesmen themselves have admitted that in order to innovate safety measures they must sell safety. Until the public cries out for certain safety devices, manufacturers will refrain from incorporating them in their models. Admittedly, price competition in the car industry is very strong and the additional cost and decreased sales that would result from safety innovations are hardly incentives to produce them. Nevertheless, it is sad that they have not taken more initiative to promote safety through their own advertising campaigns. Donald Frey of Ford recently stated that "the amount of product innovation successfully introduced into the automobile is smaller today than in previous times and is still falling." The need for external regulation by the States and Federal Government has been amply demonstrated by the recent Senate hearings on auto safety.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 9629, to allow the Federal Government to help the States, in programs for highway traffic safety, and to help them establish and improve driver education and motor vehicle inspection.

Each year brings many new drivers of a tender age. Soon there will be 10 million drivers under the age of 20. With Federal help, the States would be able to expand the benefits of driver education so that these young drivers will not be involved in accidents to the disproportionate extent that they are now. Drivers under 20 constitute less than 10 percent of the total number of drivers, but they are involved in 15 percent of the accidents. Twenty-eight States already have driver education programs, and they would be assisted in doing even better by this bill. The other 22 States would get Federal help to get them off the ground in this important educational project.

Vehicle inspection is a very important factor in maintaining automobile safety. The Federal Government would be able to help the 30 States that do not have periodic inspections establish this vital program. If one State has very high standards in its inspection program, and the State next door has none at all, then the drivers native to the State which has passed strict inspection laws are suffering at the hands of the driver whose car may have a poor or unchecked braking system.

This bill, which Senator RUSKOFF and I are cosponsoring, would also establish a National Highway Traffic Safety Center in the Department of Commerce. This proposal would consolidate the research to improve safety on the highways that various organizations are undertaking, and help publicize the results. Recently, a top official in an executive office told me that no Federal agency gathers highway accident statis-

July 22, 1965

tics, and these are so vital in determining the causes of such mishaps. The bill would also authorize the Secretary of Commerce to coordinate all Federal study programs in the field of traffic safety. From the Post Office Department to the Pentagon, these programs are going off in various directions and could accomplish a great deal more if they were coordinated.

Most important, with such authority as this measure delegates to the Department of Commerce, tremendous progress can be made in standardizing rules governing highway traffic safety throughout our 50 States.

All these activities are rightful responsibilities of the Federal Government and they are so drastically needed to improve our safety record on the highways.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am terribly saddened by the yearly increase in auto accidents and resultant deaths, because this carnage on our highways could be lessened by proper research and legislation. As Americans, we are very proud of the tremendous strides we have recently taken in space travel. How ironic it is that so much is left undone in improving our means of getting around on old mother earth.

Therefore, I strongly urge the Committee on Public Works to hold hearings on this bill and I call upon my colleagues in the House and Senate to devote themselves to the passage of this long-overdue measure.

FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the lateness of the hour here precludes more of my colleagues being present. While I have requested a special order for 15 minutes, I certainly do not intend to utilize that full period of time. Nonetheless, the message that I have I believe is of sufficient importance so that I do want to take a few minutes of the time of my colleagues to express my views on this subject matter.

Mr. Speaker, last month, I was in South Vietnam with the special subcommittee of our Armed Services Committee. We traveled some 2,500 miles within that country and were in many of the areas that have figured prominently in the news during the past few weeks: Dong Xoai, Ben Hoa, Danang, Pleiku. I have come back with a full realization that this is not a cold war—but a red hot war.

Although I was deeply concerned about reports of free world shipping to North Vietnam long before our fact-finding mission, after actually seeing what our servicemen are up against in this torn-up country, I am convinced that something must be done without delay to halt this traffic with the enemy.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], is certainly to be commended for his efforts in calling this matter to the attention of the Congress, and I have joined him in sponsoring legislation that would stop this trade by our so-called friends. However, I really do not believe that the Congress is sufficiently aware of the extent of the shipping traffic to North Vietnam on the part of free world nations or of its full significance and I take this time to underscore this shocking situation.

According to unclassified figures available through Defense Department sources, 401 ships flying the flags of the free world nations called at North Vietnam ports during 1964. Just think about this—our friends sent more than a ship a day last year to supply our enemy. And despite the publicity given the matter, through June of this year it has been reported that 74 free world ships visited ports of North Vietnam. I call your attention to the following unclassified data showing free world arrivals in North Vietnam in 1964, both by country of the vessels' registration and by month:

Mr. Speaker, I as unanimous consent to include the free world ships arriving in North Vietnam in January 1964 and the free world arrivals at North Vietnam January through June 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

FREE WORLD SHIPS ARRIVING NORTH VIETNAM
[Name of ship, flag, gross tonnage, date arrived]

JANUARY 1964

Aegalon, Greek, 7,239, January 31.
Alaska, Lebanese, 6,989, January 8.
Amoy, British, 5,871, January 5.
Belinda, British, 1,909, January 11.
Belinda, British, 1,909, January 25.
Blissful, British, 3,370, January 25.
Constantinos, Greek, 7,131, January 4.
Daikoku Maru, Japanese, 4,901, January 30.
Eastern Queen, British, 8,644, January 8.
Eugenia, Lebanese, 6,975, January 28.
Hawk, Panamanian, 7,127, January 15.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, January 7.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, January 14.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, January 21.
Kana Maru, Japanese, 2,749, January 14.
Kingford, British, 2,911, January 1.
Kingford, British, 2,911, January 19.
Kishni, British, 1,335, January 1.
Kishni, British, 1,335, January 9.
Kishni, British, 1,335, January 21.
Kushiro Maru, Japanese, 2,536, January 17.
Mariannina, Lebanese, 5,548, January 20.
Samodra Mas, British, 3,827, January 27.
Severn River, Panamanian, 7,158, January 7.
Shanghai Maru, Japanese, 2,674, January 13.

Tadjouri, French, 2,878, January 5.
Thermopylai (tanker), Greek, 8,311, January 8.

Tong Wee, British, 4,373, January 25.
Vassiliki, Lebanese, 7,192, January 6.
Yamaasa Maru, Japanese, 4,906, January 17.

FEBRUARY 1964

Adelaide Breeze, British, 4,070, February 6.
Belinda, British, 1,909, February 5.
Blissful, British, 3,370, February 26.
Constantinos, Greek, 7,131, February 21.
Daikoku Maru, Japanese, 4,901, February 3.
Datun Maru, Japanese, 2,869, February 10.
Daphne, Greek, 8,032, February 18.
Eastern Queen, British, 8,644, February 2.

Eastern Queen, British, 8,644, February 28.
Gardvik, Norwegian, 4,598, February 23.
Golden Zeta, British, 4,474, February 24.
Harrier, Greek, 7,030, February 11.
Hock Lee, Norwegian, 2,330, February 26.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, February 10.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, February 21.
Kana Maru No. 1, Japanese, 3,297, February 22.

Kishni, British, 1,335, February 3.
Kishni, British, 1,335, February 10.
Kishni, British, 1,335, February 17.
Kushiro Maru, Japanese, 2,536, February 7.
Milford, British, 1,889, February 24.
Murotan Maru, Japanese, 2,493, February 21.

Nichinan Maru, Japanese, 4,246, February 11.

Samodra Mas, British, 3,827, February 11.
Shanghai Maru, Japanese, 2,674, February 9.

Shinsho Maru, Japanese, 12,176, February 28.

Tailungshan, British, 2,711, February 25.
Tarseus, Lebanese, 5,023, February 19.
Tegean, Panamanian, 7,314, February 25.
Yamahagi Maru, Japanese, 3,571, February 11.

Yuzan Maru, Japanese, 2,013, February 7.
Zuiko Maru, Japanese, 5,617, February 11.

MARCH 1964

Admiral Hardy, Norwegian, 1,929, March 18.
Aungmyetha, Burmese, 5,661, March 7.
Belinda, British, 1,909, March 9.
Belinda, British, 1,909, March 21.
Blissful, British, 3,370, March 4.
Blissful, British, 3,370, March 23.
Boscombe Down, British, 3,361, March 6.
Cardross, British, 2,313, March 31.
Eastern Queen, British, 8,644, March 8.
Elbow River, British, 5,179, March 19.
Fortune Wind, British, 3,376, March 31.
Hock Lee, Norwegian, 2,330, March 21.
Hoi Ying, Norwegian, 3,951, March 12.
Hugo Stinnes, W. German, 10,967, March 11.

Hui An, British, 5,365, March 26.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, March 3.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, March 21.
Kazutama Maru, Japanese, 2,032, March 22.
Keiyu Maru, Japanese, 6,931, March 8.
Kushiro Maru, Japanese, 2,536, March 27.
Marina G. Parodi, Italian, 7,158, March 20.
Markus (ex-Aungmyetha), Finnish, 5,661, March 21.

Milford, British, 1,889, March 21.
Murotan Maru, Japanese, 2,493, March 3.
Peking Maru, Japanese, 2,673, March 13.
Peking Maru, Japanese, 2,673, March 21.
Rochford, British, 3,324, March 28.
Rodos, Lebanese, 7,244, March 27.
Ryuwa Maru, Japanese, 4,918, March 15.
Samodra Mas, British, 3,827, March 24.
Sansho Maru, Japanese, 2,395, March 24.
Shinsho Maru, Japanese, 3,668, March 11.
Shofuku Maru, Japanese, 6,981, March 1.
Selat Sunda, Panamanian, 1,279, March 28.
Semporna Bay, British, 5,771, March 25.
Slembe, Norwegian, 2,427, March 29.
Susanne, Norwegian, 2,503, March 9.
Tong Wee, British, 4,373, March 3.
Yamahagi Maru, Japanese, 3,571, March 10.

APRIL 1964

Aleppo, Swedish, 10,191, April 4.
Belinda, British, 1,909, April 3.
Belinda, British, 1,909, April 26.
Blissful, British, 3,370, April 16.
Cardross, British, 2,313, April 1.
Cardross, British, 2,313, April 14.
Cormorant, Liberian, 7,247, April 16.
Crawford, British, 2,232, April 1.
Dana, Norwegian, 2,752, April 6.
Daikoku Maru, Japanese, 4,901, April 12.
Elbow River, British, 5,179, April 17.
Fortune Wind, British, 3,376, April 28.
Gannet, British, 923, April 23.
Golden Zeta, British, 4,474, April 12.
Golden Zeta, British, 4,474, April 30.
Hock Lee, Norwegian, 2,330, April 17.

July 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - HOUSE

JULY 1964

Hui An, British, 5,365, April 17.
Irene X, Lebanese, 7,210, April 1.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, April 2.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, April 10.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, April 20.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, April 29.
Kapetan Andreas, Greek, 7,279, April 7.
Kana Maru No. 1, Japanese, 3,297, April 28.
Khos Belle, Greek, 8,453, April 11.
Kishni, British, 1,335, April 3.
Longford, British, 2,865, April 7.
Mui Finn, Norwegian, 1,391, April 25.
Murooran Maru, Japanese, 2,493, April 8.
Panaghtia Lourton, Lebanese, 2,742, April 8.
Parmarina, Lebanese, 6,721, April 19.
Peking Maru, Japanese, 2,673, April 10.
Prominent, Norwegian, 1,960, April 8.
Prominent, Norwegian, 1,960, April 22.
Ranghild Brovig, Norwegian, 3,128, April

24. Rochford, British, 3,324, April 4.
St. Demetrius, Lebanese, 7,198, April 20.
Sanana, Netherlands, 1,874, April 7.
Sansho Maru, Japanese, 2,395, April 25.
Selat Sunda, Panamanian, 1,279, April 2.
Slembe, Norwegian, 2,427, April 1.
Tai Koo, British, 812, April 19.
Tailungshan, British, 2,711, April 10.
Tailungshan, British, 2,711, April 18.
Tailpookhong, British, 3,373, April 1.
Tong Hong, British, 3,844, April 30.
Thebean, Greek, 7,257, April 9.

MAY 1964

Amoy, British, 5,371, May 21.
Ardirod, British, 7,025, May 17.
Blissful, British, 3,370, May 2.
Blissful, British, 3,370, May 23.
Cesco Corrado, Italian, 7,151, May 30.
Elbow River, British, 5,179, May 13.
Fortune Wind, British, 3,376, May 23.
Golden Delta, British, 5,279, May 27.
Golden Zeta, British, 4,474, May 17.
Happy Seafarer, British, 6,768, May 18.
Hienrich Jesen, Danish, 3,388, May 13.
Hock Lee, Norwegian, 2,330, May 30.
Hugo Stinnes, West German, 10,967, May 5.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, May 7.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, May 19.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, May 25.
Kapetan Andreas, Greek, 7,279, May 15.
Khos Belle, Greek, 8,453, May 11.
Kishni, British, 1,335, May 9.
Kishni, British, 1,335, May 27.
Mui Finn, Norwegian, 1,391, May 24.
Mui Heng, Norwegian, 1,398, May 2.
Murooran Maru, Japanese, 2,493, May 9.
Prominent, Norwegian, 1,960, May 12.
Prominent, Norwegian, 1,960, May 30.
Ruthy Ann, British, 7,361, May 9.
Sambas, Netherlands, 1,874, May 17.
Sansho Maru, Japanese, 2,395, May 28.
Shanghai Maru, Japanese, 2,674, May 14.
Thalis, Liberian, 7,252, May 20.
Thermopylat (tanker), Greek, 8,311, May

17. Tong Hong, British, 3,844, May 27.
Varild, Norwegian, 4,070, May 19.

JUNE 1964

Aealos, Greek, 7,300, June 30.
Apollonian, Panamanian, 7,284, June 6.
Apostolos Andreas, Greek, 5,405, June 12.
Belinda, British, 1,909, June 16.
Blissful, British, 3,370, June 14.
Happy Mariner, British, 959, June 29.
Hellas, Greek, 7,176, June 1.
Ichtyo Maru, Japanese, 1,830, June 14.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, June 4.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, June 10.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, June 20.
Kishni, British, 1,335, June 8.
Panaghtia Lourton, Lebanese, 2,742, June
Ragnhild Brovig, Norwegian, 3,128, June 4.
Ragnhild Brovig, Norwegian, 3,128, June
15. Ruthy Ann, British, 7,361, June 26.
Tailungshan, British, 2,711, June 26.
Thebean, Greek, 7,257, June 22.
Varild, Norwegian, 4,070, June 2.
Viminale, Italian, 6,955, June 27.

Adelaide Breeze, British, 4,070, July 7.
Apostolos Andreas, Greek, 5,405, July 15.
Belinda, British, 1,909, July 30.
Benadir, Italian, 3,348, July 31.
Brake, West German, 3,172, July 29.
Calliopi Michalos, Greek, 7,249, July 11.
Calliopi Michalos, Greek, 7,249, July 28.
Cardross, British, 2,313, July 16.
Denny Rose, British, 6,656, July 16.
Daigetsu Maru, Japanese, 2,848, July 15.
Daikci Maru, Japanese, 4,901, July 20.
Eftychia, Greek, 7,223, July 1.
Elbow River, British, 5,179, July 17.
Happy Mariner, British, 6,959, July 27.
Hellas, Greek, 7,176, July 11.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, July 7.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, July 20.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, July 28.
Kawana, British, 7,308, July 17.
Kishni, British, 1,335, July 17.
Kishni, British, 1,335, July 30.
Nisso Maru, Japanese, 1,567, July 14.
Paul Rickmers, West Germany, 7,910,
July 27.

Polyniki, Greek, 7,122, July 26.
Ragnhild Brovig, Norwegian, 3,128, July 22.
Sambas, Netherlands, 1,874, July 9.
Slettfjord, Norwegian, 1,902, July 5.
Tailungshan, British, 2,711, July 27.
Thebean, Greek, 7,257, July 1.
Varild, Norwegian, 4,070, July 7.

AUGUST 1964

Agia Elpis, Liberian, 6,877, August 25.
Ardrowan, British, 7,300, August 7.
Belinda, British, 1,909, August 4.
Belinda, British, 1,909, August 16.
Brake, West German, 3,172, August 9.
Brake, West German, 3,172, August 25.
Cardross, British, 1,313, August 5.
Cardross, British, 1,313, August 31.
Daigetsu Maru, Japanese, 2,848, August 15.
Golden Zeta, British, 4,474, August 31.
Greenford, British, 2,964, August 25.
Happy Mariner, British, 6,959, August 17.
Hermod, Norwegian, 2,882, August 14.
Hui An, British, 5,365, August 15.
Jarmina (tanker), Norwegian, 13,986, Au-
gust 19.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, August 5.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, August 22.
Kishni, British, 1,335, August 8.
Kishni, British, 1,335, August 16.
Kishni, British, 1,335, August 28.
Murooran Maru, Japanese, 2,493, August 1.
Murooran Maru, Japanese, 2,493, August 17.
Nisso Maru (tanker), Japanese, 1,567, Au-
gust 9.
Ole Bratt, Norwegian, 7,144, August 19.
Pacific Breeze, British, 7,256, August 17.
Ragnhild Brovig, Norwegian, 3,128, Au-
gust 11.
Ragnhild Brovig, Norwegian, 3,128, Au-
gust 21.
Ruthy Ann, British, 7,361, August 14.
Sabang, Swedish, 6,030, August 17.
Sambas, Netherlands, 1,874, August 7.
Sanrocco, Panamanian, 6,872, August 27.
Shun Fung, British, 7,148, August 17.
Slembe, Norwegian, 2,487, August 10.
Thames Breeze, British, 7,878, August 19.

SEPTEMBER 1964

Belinda, British, 1,909, September 4.
Belinda, British, 1,909, September 23.
Brake W. Ferman, 3,172, September 14.
Bunguran, Indonesian, 900, September 22.
Cardross, British, 1,313, September 3.
Daigetsu Maru, Japanese, 2,848, Septem-
ber 28.
Dartford, British, 2,739, September 20.
Denny Rose, British, 6,656, September 7.
Elbow River, British, 5,179, September 2.
Giang Seng British, 533, September 15.
Hua An, British, 5,365, September 3.
Isabel Erica, British, 7,105, September 27.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, September 15.
Jinsan British, 1,261, September 28.
Kishni, British, 1,335, September 21.
London Breeze, British, 7,897, September 4.

London Breeze, British, 7,897, September
26.
Murooran Maru, Japanese, 2,497, Septem-
ber 23.
Nisso Maru (Tanker), Japanese, 1,567,
September 7.
Norway Maru, Japanese, 5,333, September 1.
Peking Maru, Japanese, 2,673, September
24.
Probitas, Italian, 7,155, September 2.
Probitas, Italian, 7,155, September 24.
Ragnhild Brovig Norwegian, 3,128, Septem-
ber 26.
Ragnhild Brovig, Norwegian, 3,128, Sep-
tember 2.
Sambas, Netherlands, 1,874, September 26.
Seiyo Maru, Japanese, 1,999, September 23.
Slettfjord, Norwegian, 1,702, September 20.
Thebean, Greek, 7,257, September 9.
Tozai, Maru No. 5., Japanese, 3,733, Sep-
tember 7.
Tozai Maru No. 5., Japanese, 3,733, Sep-
tember 29.
Trader, Liberian, 7,091, September 9.

OCTOBER 1964

Admiral Hardy, Norwegian, 1,929, October
31.
Anastassis, Greek, 7,177, October 6.
Belinda, British, 1,909, October 25.
Brake, W. German, 3,172, October 29.
Calliopi Michalos, Greek, 7,249, October
17.
Cardross, British, 2,313, October 6.
Cresta, Liberian, 7,135, October 1.
Daigetsu Maru, Japanese, 2,848, October
24.
East Breeze, British, 8,708, October 29.
Euro, Italian, 7,210, October 10.
Fengning, British, 3,464, October 2.
Golden Alpha, British, 5,031, October 21.
Golden Delta, British, 5,279, October 17.
Golden Zeta, British, 4,474, October 29.
Hellas, Greek, 7,176, October 9.
Hellas, Greek, 7,176, October 29.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, October 10.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, October 22.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, October 31.
Kana Maru, Japanese, 2,749, October 29.
Kana Maru No. 1, Japanese, 3,297, Octo-
ber 7.
Kana Maru No. 1, Japanese, 3,297, Octo-
ber 25.
Kingford, British, 2,911, October 10.
Polyniki, Greek, 7,122, October 1.
Probitas, Italian, 7,155, October 1.
Ragnhild Brovig, Norwegian, 3,128, Octo-
ber 19.
Ruthy Ann, British, 7,361, October 22.
Shanghai Maru, Japanese, 2,674, October
21.
Slettfjord, Norwegian, 1,702, October 9.
Slettfjord, Norwegian, 1,702, October 28.
Surabaya Maru, Japanese, 7,057, October
26.
Tarantella, Swedish, 3,816, October 7.
Tokushima Maru, Japanese, 407, October
11.
Trader, Liberian, 7,091, October 6.
Tritonia, Liberian, 7,165, October 27.
Wishford (Ex-Fengning), British, 3,464,
October 27.

NOVEMBER 1964

Alcyonis, Greek, 7,365, November 4.
Astir, Lebanese, 5,234, November 11.
Belinda, British, 1,909, November 11.
Belinda, British, 1,909, November 29.
Calliopi Michalos, Greek, 7,249, November
30.
Daikci Maru, Japanese, 4,901, November 21.
Daikyo Maru (tanker) Japanese, 13,224,
November 21.
East Wales, British, 7,359, November 4.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, November 13.
Jinsan, British, 1,261, November 22.
Keckring, Netherlands, 4,963, November 7.
Kingford, British, 2,911, November 1.
Kishin Maru, Japanese, 1,963, November 26.
Mansei Maru, Japanese, 1,595, November
12.
Maria Despina, Lebanese, 7,254, November
12.

July 22, 1965

Milford, British, 1,889, November 27.
 Murotan Maru, Japanese, 2,493, November 18.
 Murotan Maru, Japanese, 2,493, November 30.
 Rochford, British, 3,324, November 7.
 Rochford, British, 3,324, November 28.
 Ruthy Ann, British, 7,361, November 1.
 Ruthy Ann, British, 7,361, November 30.
 Sansho Maru, Japanese, 2,395, November 11.
 San Francisco, Italian, 2,284, November 1.
 Santa Granda, British, 7,229, November 21.
 Seacab, Panamanian, 7,276, November 9.
 Seacab, Panamanian, 7,276, November 20.
 Settemart, Italian, 7,181, November 29.
 Slettfjord, Norwegian, 1,702, November 8.
 Spalmatori, Greek, 7,310, November 2.
 Thebean, Greek, 7,257, November 11.
 Tokushima Maru, Japanese, 407, November 11.
 Tozal Maru No. 5, Japanese, 3,783, November 18.
 Troyan, Lebanese, 7,243, November 21.
 DECEMBER 1964
 Amoy, British, 5,371, December 1.
 Astir, Lebanese, 5,324, December 23.
 Barbarino, Greek, 7,084, December 29.
 Cappera, Italian, 7,189, December 27.
 Crawford, British, 2,232, December 11.
 Daigetsu Maru, Japanese, 2,848, December 11.
 Dana, Norwegian, 2,752, December 17.
 Dicoronia, Liberian, 7,260, December 14.
 East Wales, British, 7,359, December 20.
 Elbow River, British, 5,179, December 17.
 Elbow River, British, 5,179, December 29.
 Golden Alpha, British, 5,031, December 7.
 Golden Zeta, British, 4,474, December 14.
 Helmos, Lebanese, 5,236, December 27.
 Hermod, Norwegian, 2,882, December 2.
 Jinsan, British, 1,261, December 5.
 Jinsan, British, 1,261, December 23.
 Katerina, Greek, 7,155, December 21.
 Kishin Maru, Japanese, 1,953, December 2.
 Ikuta Maru, Japanese, 2,095, December 27.
 Longford, British, 2,865, December 15.
 Marissa, Lebanese, 7,234, December 17.
 Milford, British, 1,889, December 7.
 Murotan Maru, Japanese, 2,493, December 19.
 Ruthy Ann, British, 7,361, December 26.
 Sambas, Netherlands, 1,874, December 24.
 Santa Granda, British, 7,229, December 23.
 Seisho Maru, Japanese, 2,257, December 28.
 Slettfjord, Norwegian, 1,702, December 22.
 Tertric, Lebanese, 7,045, December 16.
 Toula, Lebanese, 4,561, December 7.
 Unkai Maru No. 6, Japanese, 3,411, December 16.
 Vermont, British, 7,381, December 21.
 Yuzan Maru, Japanese, 2,013, December 1.

January through June 1965 free world arrivals North Vietnam—Summary of arrivals by flag

JANUARY	
British	10
Japanese	1
Greek	1
Norwegian	—
Dutch	—
Lebanese	2
Total	14
FEBRUARY	
British	15
Japanese	1
Greek	2
Norwegian	—
Dutch	—
Lebanese	—
Total	18
MARCH	
British	6
Japanese	—
Greek	2
Norwegian	2

January through June 1965 free world arrivals North Vietnam—Summary of arrivals by flag—Continued

MARCH	
Dutch	3
Lebanese	1
Total	14
APRIL	
British	1
Japanese	—
Greek	1
Norwegian	3
Dutch	—
Lebanese	—
Total	5
MAY	
British	7
Japanese	—
Greek	3
Norwegian	4
Dutch	—
Lebanese	1
Total	15
JUNE	
British	5
Japanese	—
Greek	3
Norwegian	1
Dutch	—
Lebanese	—
Total	9

FREE WORLD SHIPS ARRIVING NORTH VIETNAM JANUARY 1965

(Name of ship, flag, gross tonnage, date arrived)

Aiolos II, Lebanese, 7,256, January 26.
 Cardross, British, 2,314, January 29.
 Elbow River, British, 5,179, January 7.
 Golden Zeta, British, 4,474, January 7.
 Hakuyo Maru, Japanese, 6,430, January 9.
 Jinsan, British, 1,261, January 1.
 Jinsan, British, 1,261, January 10.
 Jinsan, British, 1,261, January 17.
 Jinsan, British, 1,261, January 25.
 Longford, British, 2,865, January 1.
 Panagos, Lebanese, 7,133, January 28.
 Saronis, Greek, 7,271, January 25.
 Santa Granda, British, 7,229, January 21.
 Wakasa Bay, British, 7,040, January 16.

FEBRUARY 1965

Bidford, British, 2,865, February 5.
 Cardamilitis, Greek, 7,163, February 7.
 Cardross, British, 2,314, February 15.
 Dartford, British, 2,739, February 7.
 Elbow River, British, 5,179, February 17.
 Fortune Wind, British, 3,376, February 15.
 Jinsan, British, 1,261, February 1.
 Jinsan, British, 1,261, February 14.
 Jinsan, British, 1,261, February 23.
 Jinsan, British, 1,261, February 28.
 Longford, British, 2,865, February 23.
 Metwa Maru, Japanese, 4,975, February 15.
 Neuglade, British, 7,368, February 11.
 Rochford, British, 3,324, February 20.
 Stamwear, British, 8,108, February 23.
 Syros, Greek, 7,176, February 7.
 Wakasa Bay, British, 7,040, February 23.
 Wishford, British, 3,464, February 27.

MARCH 1965

Bidford, British, 2,865, March 5.
 Cardross, British, 2,314, March 4.
 Dukat, Norwegian, 1,401, March 2.
 Dukat, Norwegian, 1,401, March 15.
 Elbow River, British, 5,179, March 4.
 Golden Alpha, British, 5,031, March 7.
 Hallands Diep, Dutch, 9,631, March 31.*
 Longford, British, 2,865, March 27.
 Nissos Paros, Greek, 1,953, March 4.*
 Rastotis, Greek, 7,138, March 23.
 Sambas, Dutch, 1,874, March 14.

* Estimated.

Sambas, Dutch, 1,874, March 25.
 Santa Granda, British, 7,229, March 27.
 San Spyridon, Lebanese, 7,260, March 13.

APRIL 1965

Grecian Isles, Greek, 9,173, April 23.
 Mut Heng, Norwegian, 1,398, April 29.
 Santa Granda, British, 7,229, April 13.
 Slettfjord, Norwegian, 1,705, April 4.
 Slettfjord, Norwegian, 1,705, April 13.

MAY 1965

Antarctica, British, 8,785, May 21.
 Cardross, British, 2,313, May 5.
 Cardross, British, 2,313, May 29.
 Fortune Wind, British, 3,376, May 6.
 Gisna, Norwegian, 6,030, May 5.
 Gisna, Norwegian, 6,030, May 29.
 Herborg, Norwegian, 3,312, May 21.
 Irena, Greek, 7,232, May 21.
 Kawana, British, 7,308, May 27.
 Nancy Dee, British, 6,547, May 31.
 Nymfja, Greek, 7,176, May 1.
 Phoevos, Greek, 9,949, May 16.
 Shirley Christine, British, 6,724, May 30.
 Slettfjord, Norwegian, 1,705, May 6.
 Yanzilas, Lebanese, 10,051, May 3.

JUNE 1965

Avisfaith, British, 7,868, June 7.
 Alkon, Greek, 7,150, June 6.
 Cardross, British, 2,313, June 28.
 Helena, Norwegian, 2,529, June 21.
 Kyvernitis, Greek, 9,360, June 1.
 Newheath, British, 5,891, June 13.
 Newmoat, British, 7,151, June 29.
 Phoenician Dawn, British, 8,708, June 13.
 Strovili, Greek, 7,181, June 5.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, study this information carefully and ponder the billions of dollars in aid we have given these countries. As a matter of fact, I am told by our Appropriations Foreign Operations Subcommittee that since World War II we have given almost \$41 billion in aid to the countries that have been carrying on this trade with North Vietnam. But even more astounding is the fact that the foreign aid authorization bill for the coming fiscal year—and now in conference—proposes to give aid to six of the countries whose ships have been carrying cargoes to North Vietnam during the first half of this year. How can we go home and face the American taxpayers and ask them to foot the tax bill to pay for the war in Vietnam, and at the same time ask them to contribute their tax money to aid the countries that are supplying our enemy? This is so inconsistent that it can never be explained. Our men are dying in Vietnam—over 500 have been killed by enemy action—and our friends, by supplying the enemy, are helping to kill them.

These are unclassified figures only—let me assure you that the classified reports are even more alarming. I have seen them, and you should see them. Every member of this Congress has a legitimate right and I believe a moral obligation to become informed about this matter, and I hope that each of you will request the classified information on this astonishing situation.

But equally shocking is the report that I have just received from the Maritime Administration listing the foreign vessels which called at North Vietnamese ports between January 1, 1964 and June 5, 1965, and have also called at our own U.S. ports.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the Rec-

July 22, 1965

Approved For Release

2003/10/15 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300180001-9

17337

ORD a list of those vessels, the flag, the registered owner, port of call and date of call.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FAR-num). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.
Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the list I referred to is as follows:

Foreign vessels which allegedly stopped at North Vietnamese ports during 1964 and through June 5, 1965

Name of vessel	Flag	Registered owner	U.S. Port of call	1964	1965
Aegalon	Greece	Sapphire Cia., Nav., S.A., Panama	Newport News, Va.		Feb. 22
Agia Elpis	Liberia	Cia Marvalla Nav., S.A., Panama	Tampa, Fla.		Feb. 16
Alcyonis	Greece	Heroullana Cia. Mar., S.A., Panama	Jacksonville, Fla.	Jan. 6	
Do	do	do	Charleston, S.C.	Jan. 10	
Do	do	do	Philadelphia, Pa.	Jan. 15	
Do	do	do	Cleveland, Ohio	Apr. 21	
Do	do	do	Detroit, Mich.	Apr. 24	
Do	do	do	Bay City	Apr. 28	
Do	do	do	Chicago, Ill.	May 1	
Do	do	do	Detroit, Mich.	May 13	
Aleppo	Sweden	Rederi A/B Fraternitas, Goteborg	Newark, N.J.	Sept. 8	
Do	do	do	Brooklyn, N.Y.	Sept. 9	
Do	do	do	Poughkeepsie, N.Y.	Sept. 11	
Do	do	do	Camden, N.J.	Sept. 12	
Do	do	do	Philadelphia, Pa.	Sept. 13	
Do	do	do	Port Arthur, Tex.	Sept. 20	
Anastassis	Greece	Resurreccion Cia. Nav., S.A., Panama	Jacksonville, Fla.		Apr. 6
Do	do	do	Baltimore, Md.		Apr. 19
Do	do	do	Norfolk, Va.		Apr. 22
Do	do	do	San Diego, Calif.	Apr. 1	
Do	do	do	Los Angeles, Calif.	Apr. 2	
Do	do	do	San Francisco, Calif.	Apr. 10	
Cesco Corrado	Italy	Corrado Societa di Navigazione, Genoa	Providence, R.I.	June 4	
Do	do	do	Los Angeles, Calif.	Sept. 28	
Constantinos	Greece	Conquistador Cia. Mar., S.A., Panama	Houston, Tex.	Jan. 22	
Cornorant	Liberia	San Pedro Cia. Armadora, S.A., Panama	New Haven, Conn.	June 22	
Do	do	do	Norfolk, Va.	Aug. 4	
Do	do	do	Houston, Tex.	July 4	
Demetrius	Lebanon	26th October Maritime Co., Ltd., Monrovia	New Orleans, La.	Mar. 29	
Dicronia	Liberia	Bahia Salinas Cia. Nav., S.A., Panama	Boston, Mass.	Sept. 15	
Do	do	do	Tampa, Fla.		Mar. 13
Do	do	do	Galveston, Tex.		Mar. 6
Do	do	do	New Orleans, La.		
Eftychia	Greece	Margaronis, Dem. P. & Sons, Athens	Norfolk, Va.	Sept. 22	
Hugo Stinnes	West Germany	Stinnes, Hugo, G.M.B.H., Mulheim/Ruhr, Germany	Baton Rouge, La.	Nov. 10	
Do	do	do	San Francisco, Calif.		Apr. 9
Do	do	do	Oakland, Calif.		Do.
Do	do	do	San Francisco, Calif.		Apr. 10
Do	do	do	Sacramento, Calif.		Apr. 13
Do	do	do	Baltimore, Md.		Mar. 13
Jarmina	Norway	Aksjeselsk, Kosmos	New York, N.Y.		Apr. 21
Do	do	do	Los Angeles, Calif.	May 23	
Katerina	Greece	Marsiguna Cia. Nav. S.A., Panama	San Juan, P.R.	Aug. 20	
Khos Belle	do	Pioneer Shipping Development, Inc., Panama	New Orleans, La.	Sept. 9	
Do	do	do	New York, N.Y.	Jan. 7	
Marina G. Parodi	Italy	Enrico Parodi	Baltimore, Md.	Aug. 3	
Do	do	do	Newport News, Va.	Aug. 4	
Do	do	do	Norfolk, Va.	Aug. 5	
Do	do	do	Baltimore, Md.	Oct. 19	
Do	do	do	Norfolk, Va.	Oct. 28	
Do	do	do	Newport News, Va.		May 6
Nisso Maru	Japan	Kuwana Kaifu K.K., Ehime	San Francisco, Calif.	Feb. 29	
Do	do	do	Los Angeles, Calif.	Mar. 1	
Do	do	do	do	Apr. 29	
Do	do	do	Eagle Harbor	June 12	
Rodos	Lebanon	Orient Shipping Corp., Monrovia	Seattle, Wash.	Dec. 10	
Do	do	do	San Pedro, Calif.	Dec. 20	
Do	do	do	Panama City, Fla.	Jan. 12	
Do	do	do	Tampa, Fla.	Mar. 29	
Do	do	do	Richmond, Va.	Apr. 7	
Seyern River	Panama	International Navigat. Corp., Monrovia	Norfolk, Va.		Mar. 4
Do	do	do	New York, N.Y.	July 4	
Do	do	do	Houston, Tex.	July 12	
Spalmatori	Greece	Spalmatori Cia. Nav., S.A., Panama	New Orleans, La.	July 17	
Do	do	do	Tampa, Fla.		Jan. 16
Do	do	do	Lake Charles, La.		
Do	do	do	New York, N.Y.	Nov. 30	
Tarantella	Sweden	Salenrederierna A/B	Boston, Mass.	Jan. 6	
Thalis	Liberia	Cia. Okeania de Nav., S.A., Panama	Tampa, Fla.	Sept. 8	
Do	do	do	Houston, Tex.		Jan. 14
Do	do	do	New Orleans, La.	Jan. 17	
Trader	do	Bahia Salinas Cia. Nav., S.A., Panama	Boston, Mass.	May 18	
Trifonia	do	Cia. Mare Nostrum, S.A., Panama	Tacoma, Wash.	Aug. 20	
Do	do	do	San Francisco, Calif.	Aug. 31	
Do	do	do	Philadelphia, Pa.		Jan. 21

1963.

There are 24 ships, I am told, that have hauled their cargoes to North Vietnam and also have used our own U.S. ports to further enhance their profit. Apparently this is an arrangement that pays off pretty well for I am told that these 24 ships have called a total of 75 times in our ports since January 1964. Our colleague from Florida, Mr. ROGERS, has introduced a bill, which I have also joined in sponsoring, which would deny the use of our ports to these vessels which are also trading with North Vietnam. How can we let ships haul their cargoes to North Vietnam and then use the ports of this country at a time when

we are spending \$350 million a year to subsidize our own merchant marine that today hauls less than 10 percent of our export trade?

I hold no brief for the argument that the cargoes being unloaded in North Vietnam by our friends are not of a military value. I take violent exception to the report of the Department of State dated June 9, 1965, on H.R. 6154 and H.R. 6301, both bills to curb this traffic, which said in part:

Free world ships carry a substantial share of North Vietnam's total sea-borne imports, but the goods carried are virtually all non-strategic in nature, comprise only a small

part of that country's economic availabilities and are of secondary importance to its war capabilities. Moreover, if free world ships were removed from this trade they could eventually be replaced by Communist bloc vessels.

I say to you that any goods that are wanted in North Vietnam ports help our enemy and help defeat our national objectives to stop Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

I have written to President Johnson asking that he give his personal attention to this incredulous state of affairs. I urge all Members of Congress to join in helping to find some means to stop

July 22, 1965

this trading with the enemy that defies any explanation. Something must be done immediately. How can we send more and more young men to Vietnam—and how can we talk of calling up the Reserves—when we Members of Congress sit on our hands in this House of Representatives and tolerate this national scandal.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I certainly want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan for whom I have the greatest esteem for bringing this so forcibly as well as so eloquently to the attention of the House this evening.

As a fellow member of the Committee on Armed Services, I would like to associate myself with everything that he has said. I appreciate that he has withheld security and classified information while revealing this tragic and terrible unclassified list of ships of foreign flags.

I would submit, of course, that we are in a marine engineers' strike which involves our own flagships to the point where the Deputy Director of Transportation for Defense has had for the first time to notify all shippers that they may use foreign flagships.

But this still does not excuse those ships from making ports of call in the Communist countries and coming back to our own ports. We could use foreign flags which are strictly neutral or strictly friendly.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I should like to ask the gentleman in the well of the House, who has taken the trouble to visit Vietnam and made such a strenuous trip, on which we have had a prior report, if he does not consider that petroleum, oil and lubricants—POL—are considered vital materials of war.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Indeed they are. My colleague is well aware of this. There is much that could be said about it. Again, we have security problems.

Mr. HALL. Up a very tenuous river with the name of Cao there is a huge POL depository, including refineries and storage tanks, above and below ground, on a very tenuous artery which can be reached by canals, by train, and so forth only from the ocean, the canal for which has to be dredged constantly along the Cao River. Would it not seem that at least these foreign flag vessels which carry POL to this lone refinery in North Vietnam should be interdicted if we are in truth interested in preventing the further spread of and the further mobilization of the North Vietnam aggressor in South Vietnam?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am in complete agreement with the gentleman's observation.

Mr. HALL. I am certainly in agreement with what the gentleman has said, and I appreciate what he has brought to the floor of the House tonight. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am grateful for the contribution the gentleman has made to this very delicate problem.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTION TO PURCHASERS OF BUSINESS EQUIPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FARNUM). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, recently, I placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of business machines which are currently on the Purchase List by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Ralph Roberts. At that time I pointed out that up to 89 percent of the amount of the excise tax reduction was being retained by business machine companies instead of being passed on to the consumer. In this case, the Congress of the United States.

In reply to these charges the International Business Machines Corp. indicated that they had passed into effect a price increase as of October 1964 which could not take effect for contract customers like the Federal Government until the new contract year, beginning July 1965.

In further researching this problem, I have determined that the Excise Tax Committee of the Business Equipment Manufacturers Association presented a statement to the Ways and Means Committee on July 24, 1964. It is my understanding that at that time and to the present time the IBM Corp. was an active participant in and was represented by the statement made by the Business Equipment Manufacturers Association to the Ways and Means Committee at that time.

In summary, Mr. R. Stanley Laing, representing the Business Equipment Manufacturers Association stated on page 372 of the Ways and Means hearings, volume 3:

It is, therefore, primarily on behalf of the users of business equipment and their customers that the manufacturers of these products advocate repeal of this discriminatory tax. [By far its worst feature [i.e., the excise tax] is that it constitutes a direct charge on the cost of doing business and to that degree, tends to discourage capital investment in equipment designed specifically to improve the productivity and efficiency of American business. Either directly or indirectly the tax is passed on and pyramided through all layers of distribution as an added cost to virtually all products and services in the country.

Mr. Laing further added on page 381: American business would invest the funds so released in capital expenditures whether in the form of new production facilities, machine tools, or business machines.

The existence of the excise tax on business machines results, therefore, in a corresponding reduction in the unit volume of capital equipment purchased. By reducing unit volume the total employment opportunities of all capital goods manufacturers are adversely affected.

The total effect, from what I can gather, from the testimony presented before the Ways and Means Committee on the subject of excise tax reduction was that it was the intention of the major business manufacturers to pass on the excise tax reduction to the consumer.

Contrary to this statement, I.B.M. subsequently released a schedule of price increases which seems calculated to create a total washout of the benefits of the tax reduction. Both the small businessman and the large corporation, who according to the Business Machine Association were to be assisted in purchasing additional equipment with these added funds are no longer the beneficiaries because of the program of price increases which I.B.M. and other manufacturers have put into effect.

The promises before the Ways and Means Committee have become meaningless.

I am including in the RECORD at this point a copy of the letter which I have sent to Mr. Lawson B. Knott, Acting Administrator of the General Service Administration, in which I ask him to determine the possibilities of renegotiating the contract agreements with all business machine manufacturers so that the contract prices can reflect the excise tax reduction.

JULY 22, 1965.

Mr. LAWSON B. KNOTT,
Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. KNOTT: In view of the fact that current Government prices on business machine equipment fail to reflect any substantial reduction because of the recent repeal of Federal excise taxes, as you can readily see in the table which I submit herewith as Exhibit A, I recommend that your office enter into a renegotiation of contract agreements with all business machine manufacturers so that the Government itself may become a recipient of the full measure of the excise tax reduction recently enacted by the Congress of the United States.

During hearings before the Ways and Means Committee last year, and specifically on July 24, 1964, Mr. R. Stanley Laing, chairman of the Excise Tax Committee of the Business Equipment Manufacturers Association, stated in his argument for a repeal of the excise tax on business machines, as follows:

"It is, therefore, primarily on behalf of the users of business equipment and their customers that the manufacturers of these products advocate repeal of this discriminatory tax. By far its worst feature—i.e., the excise tax—is that it constitutes a direct charge on the cost of doing business and to that degree tends to discourage capital investment in equipment designed specifically to improve the productivity and efficiency of American business. Either directly or indirectly the tax is passed on and pyramided through all layers of distribution as an added cost to virtually all products and services in the country."

The manufacturers referred to in Exhibit A are members of this organization and the Federal Government has a right to assume that the benefits of excise tax reductions would also be made applicable to Federal procurement.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. VANIK,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of this body the third study recently completed by my office of the prices of representative consumer items affected by the excise tax reduction in retail outlets in the Washington metropolitan area.

July 22, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/15 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300180001-9

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

17325

Mr. GROSS. I am not interested in agreements made by members of any particular committee.

Mr. ALBERT. I only gave that as a predicate to the fact that it was the House that finally disposed of these amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON THE HOUSING BILL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency have until midnight July 23 to file a report on H.R. 7984, the Housing bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, am I to understand that the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] has agreed to this arrangement?

Mr. ALBERT. I have been so advised.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have until midnight July 23 to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 2984.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman give us the title of the bill?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, it is the extension of the Research Facilities Act. It is a unanimous report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

MENTAL HEALTH AND RETARDATION BILL

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have until midnight, July 23, to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 2985.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, what is the nature of the legislation?

Mr. HARRIS. The bill has to do with the extension of the staffing provisions of the mental health and retardation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 510

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have until midnight to file a unanimous conference report on the bill S. 510, which is Public Health Service, community health services extension amendments, which expires this year.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RE-REFERRAL OF BILL

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, H.R. 9743, be re-referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE ROBERT J. BULKLEY

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I learn today of the death last night of former Congressman and Senator Robert J. Bulkley, of Ohio.

Senator Bulkley first entered the Congress of the United States as a Representative in Congress, in 1910, from the 21st District of Ohio, which I now represent. In the 62d Congress he served with great distinction as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, where he participated in the drafting of the first Federal Reserve Act and the Farm Loan Act.

In 1930 he was elected to the U.S. Senate. In 1932 he was reelected to the U.S. Senate and led the ticket in Ohio. He was a close friend and admirer of President Franklin D. Roosevelt and vigorously supported the President's programs.

The citizens of Ohio will always be grateful for the tremendous contribution of this distinguished and honored citizen.

(Mr. SWEENEY (at the request of Mr. VANIK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. SWEENEY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

U.S. ROLE IN VIETNAM "HOPELESS," SAYS ALLEGAN DOCTOR

(Mr. HUTCHINSON (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, no issue faced by this Nation in recent years has been more confusing to the American people than our role in Vietnam.

It is an ideal of this Republic that momentous national decisions are debated and resolved on the floor of the House. Although it is regrettable that there has not been a full debate here as far as Vietnam is concerned, we cannot say that debate on the subject has been lacking.

The issue is being debated; if not by the Congress, then by the American people, in the press, on the radio, in barber shops, and on street corners.

The views of one American who spent 6 years as a surgeon in Vietnam and only recently returned to start private practice in Michigan are set forth in an article in the Grand Rapids Press issue of June 18, which under leave to extend, I insert at this point in the RECORD:

U.S. ROLE IN VIETNAM "HOPELESS," SAYS ALLEGAN DOCTOR (By Neil Munro)

ALLEGAN.—"Anybody who isn't confused by the Vietnam situation isn't informed," says Dr. Ray Smith, Jr.

Dr. Smith was in South Vietnam for 6 years, and for 4½ of those years he was the only American surgeon there. He was employed by the American construction company that builds all the foreign aid projects but also treated many South Vietnamese and many American servicemen.

He has been practicing in Allegan since March, but his frustration and indignation over the Vietnam situation have not left him.

"I knew," he says, "2 years ago, and Army intelligence knew, that the Vietcong had mortars and ammo at Da Nang Airbase to blow it up. And then when they finally did, the big brass came and said they wondered how it all happened."

Dr. Smith has a long string of similar "horror stories" and he likes to get them off his chest. Since coming back to the United States with his wife and five children he has told his stories before many service clubs in this area.

The Da Nang incident is, he says, "typical of our war effort over there."

He adds that "all the nations who have embassies there—and there are a lot of them—have nice, big embassies with big yards with walls around them."

"But not the United States. We have to have a dilapidated old building in the middle of town. So all the Vietcong have to do to blow it up is to drive a car to within 6 feet of the door and blow the car up."

Dr. Smith explains, "I could have been there. I went there many times; almost wore a hole in the elbow of my coat leaning on a counter just inside the door, just 6 feet from the car."

The Vietcong, he says, can do anything they want anywhere they want to do it.

He lived in the American compound at Saigon International Airport, supposedly the most secure area in the country.

"But one day 10 men—10 men—came to the door and said they were there to check the telephone. My wife checked their identification cards, which seemed all right, so they checked the phone and left."

"I realized, when she told me, that the phone company doesn't have 10 repairmen. And I hadn't called them. The phone company hadn't sent them," he recalls.

He explains it later turned out they were Vietcong who entered the compound, past four guard houses, just to see what they could get away with.

They also drove a truck loaded with dynamite into an airbase and blew it up, he says.

"Seven members of the base security guard were in on that.

"We have no secrets over there. The Vietcong are everywhere. We might as well distribute the proceedings of our top-secret conferences in pamphlet form," Dr. Smith says.

Americans in the United States have some big misunderstandings on what's going on in South Vietnam, he believes.

"The conflict between the Buddhists and the Catholics is not a religious conflict like most people think. Here's the real background. Most of the Catholics, at least this is my impression, are still more Buddhists than anything else. Their Catholicism is a veneer.

"And most of the Catholics in South Vietnam," Dr. Smith says, "are from North Vietnam. They are refugees the Navy shipped down there after the country was divided by the 1954 Geneva agreement. Even former President Diem and all his cabinet were from North Vietnam."

He says, "The first thing the South Vietnamese knew, the North Vietnamese were running the country. It was very disturbing to them. The South Vietnamese are peasants and farmers. The North Vietnamese are more personally aggressive."

Dr. Smith also believes Americans have the wrong idea of the attitude of the South Vietnamese toward the war effort.

He reports that few of them seem to care who rules them "because the concept of loyalty to a government is nonexistent."

"Never in 10 years have we ever gotten any of our aid down to the peasants," he charges.

"We have been shipping surplus foods over there; but the peasants don't get it. My family paid good money in stores to buy cans of food which were labeled 'Donated to the people of South Vietnam by the people of the United States of America: Not to be sold.'"

"The South Vietnamese, he says, "don't know which side to be on."

"We're trying to jam our good will down their throats and they don't like it. Their attitude is, 'You can give us your money but don't tell us how to spend it. And if you take it away we can get it somewhere else,'" he says.

"The Vietnamese can drive us crazy," he says. "We try to be so polite to them and try to advise them of what to do—respecting the sovereignty of their country—and they laugh at us and think it's a sign of weakness. And then they're likely to go and do just the opposite of what we advised."

Dr. Smith says the South Vietnamese don't understand the democratic processes at all.

"The only way we could handle them—and I'm not advocating this—is to boss them around the way the Communists do," he says.

"As for the war itself," he says, "It's been getting worse day by day but the American officials are trying to put it in a good light. They said once, 'The attacks are more frequent but seem to be getting less effective.'"

He adds that the "big, tough United States" lost whatever prestige or "face" it once had in Vietnam when it let its people be bombed and murdered without retaliating. "We should have started the bombing 3 years ago," Dr. Smith believes.

He says the whole confusing Vietnam situation has a sort of Alice in Wonderland atmosphere and it is "hopeless" to think of the United States ever coming out on top.

TO EQUALIZE TAXATION ON REDEMPTION OF PREFERRED STOCK

(Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced an amendment to section 302(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 dealing with the income tax treatment of the proceeds received in the redemption of preferred stock. To the extent that the proceeds do not exceed the amount paid in to the corporation on the issuance of such stock, the amendment provides that these proceeds shall be treated as a distribution in part or full payment in exchange for the stock and not as a dividend.

My amendment to the Internal Revenue Code is made necessary because of the distinction now made between the proceeds of preferred stock in differing situations. Under the present law, in certain cases, redemption of preferred stock is treated for tax purposes as return on capital, while in others this redemption on the same stock is treated as dividends and taxed accordingly. This distinction is based only upon whether the owner of preferred stock owns in addition a substantially proportionate ratio of common stock. If he does, the proceeds on the preferred stock are treated as dividends for tax purposes, while if he does not, these same proceeds are treated as return on capital. My amendment would remove this arbitrary distinction and permit proceeds on preferred stock, insofar as it represents capital invested in money or goods, to be treated as a return of capital.

Preferred stock is in reality a cross between common stock and bonds. However, the same reasoning which underlies the present distinction among owners of preferred stock and common stock does not apply to holders of both bonds and the common stock, so long as the bonds represent true indebtedness and the equity capital is sufficient for the needs of the corporation.

The present taxation of the income derived from the redemption of preferred stock as dividend income turns some corporations, especially closely held family corporations, to debt financing rather than equity financing when further investment is needed. A change in the system of taxation of the redemption proceeds of paid-for preferred stock would have the beneficial effect of making equity financing more attractive to the corporation and, in the long run, produce greater tax revenues.

The taxation of capital return as distinguished from interest or dividends paid on that capital is contrary to our Constitution. This amendment would assure proper tax treatment for the redemption of all preferred stock.

LATEST BATTLE OF BUREAUCRACY AGAINST RURAL AMERICA COMES FROM THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Mr. LANGEN (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend

his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

M. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the latest battle of bureaucracy against rural America comes from the Post Office Department. Recent arbitrary decisions by the Department prove conclusively that this so-called servant of the people has turned on rural America with a vengeance and now threatens the very foundation of our national strength.

The Department claims that plans to terminate mail hauling and handling contracts with railroads operating in Minnesota and transfer such service to trucks on star routes are being carried out to provide better service at lower cost. I say they have jammed an unworkable plan down the throats of the public and that actually it is a drastic reduction of service that threatens to cost rural communities their economic lives.

The people of Minnesota have protested by the hundreds, businessmen from small towns and metropolitan areas alike have expressed alarm, and the local and State governments are on record against this move. But the thinkers in Washington have turned a deaf ear on their pleas.

The Post Office Department officials conducted a public meeting on the subject on June 24 at Thief River Falls, Minn. This meeting was held just 6 days before the new plan went into effect, and it was obvious that the Post Office Department officials arrived with a closed mind, disregarding the wishes of the public.

Under the new star route system, towns in northwestern Minnesota will receive their incoming mail later in the morning, will be forced to post outgoing mail as early as midafternoon and will lose Sunday and holiday service.

A typical example is noted in one community near the Canadian border. This town used to have dependable 7-day-a-week service with mail in their post office boxes by 8:30 in the morning. Five years ago, they had their service upgraded through the use of the star system so the arrival time of mail varied by as much as 5 hours. Two years ago they lost the Sunday delivery, so their Sunday papers now come on Monday. Now, with the new July 1 overall plan for Minnesota their mail arrives at 9:30 or later in the morning and they have to post outgoing mail by 3:15 in the afternoon, a period of less than 6 hours. I would hardly call this progress. Now the State is extending this program of reduced service to the whole State.

The regional postal director's report to Washington actually admitted there would be at least a slight impairment of service to post offices north of Thief River Falls, Minn. That report gave us a big clue as to Departmental thinking when it said:

In general these offices are in the \$2,000 or less per annum class, so a relatively small number of patrons will be affected by the later receipt (of mail).

Apparently the Post Office Department considers residents in sparsely populated areas as second-class citizens who do not

tice Goldberg, the United States has put forward a man of national stature and immense ability, whose particular talents could prove of major service not only to the United States but to the U.N. as well.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, July 21, 1965]

GOOD CHOICE

In naming Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg the new U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., President Johnson has picked one of the most skilled and patient negotiators in the country.

Many will be surprised at the appointment because Justice Goldberg is mostly thought of as a lawyer and not for his prowess on the international scene.

However, Mr. Goldberg has a brilliant mind and is a good speaker (a must for the U.N. job), so we believe him adequately equipped to talk to the Communists.

In taking the ambassadorship, Mr. Goldberg suffers a salary cut from \$39,500 to \$30,000 a year.

Surely a strong sense of patriotism must motivate him to give up a lifetime job with all the dignity that goes with it to take over an assignment at the U.N. which will be full of harassment. There is, however, no worthier cause than peace.

We wish him well in his new, and very trying post.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, July 20, 1965]

HAIL L.B.J.'S CHOICE AS PROOF HE WON'T DOWNGRADE U.N.

(By Pierre J. Huss)

UNITED NATIONS, July 20.—Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg's appointment today as the new U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations immediately ruled out prevalent fears here that President Johnson would downgrade the U.N.

First reaction was that hardly anyone in the United States has had more rich experience in tough negotiation with "the other side" than Justice Goldberg, who has dealt with knotty labor relations for more than 30 years.

Justice Goldberg's first words in accepting the U.N. post—"grant us peace"—were seized upon as the probable keynote of his coming activities in the cold war arena at global headquarters.

Although he is far less known abroad that was his predecessor, Adlai Stevenson, it is felt here that his long-demonstrated sense of fairplay and justice will help him at the U.N. to overcome the first obstacles and enable him to bring his experience to good use in the international field.

Justice Goldberg's appointment was announced as members of the Security Council convened to discuss the Dominican situation, paid tribute to Mr. Stevenson, Deputy Soviet Ambassador Platon Morozov opened the session by calling for a minute of silence in Mr. Stevenson's memory. It was the first Soviet tribute to Mr. Stevenson here since his death.

A quick canvassing of U.N. diplomats pointed to a general welcoming for Justice Goldberg, although the Arab countries may hold certain reservations because he is Jewish.

Sources close to Ambassador Stevenson recalled that in recent months he had privately hinted about retirement and had stressed seemingly at random his close friendship with Justice Goldberg.

One of the first tasks for Justice Goldberg will be to tackle the paramount issue of financial bankruptcy facing the world organization.

Ambassador Stevenson had his heart set on solving that problem, which paralyzed the 19th session of the General Assembly, before the 20th session began in September.

Justice Goldberg will have to acquaint himself in the first week at the U.N. with the backlog of behind-the-scenes maneuvers and negotiations underway between East and West on finding a solution to the debt crisis.

The crisis arose because of the refusal of the Soviet Union, France, and other nations to contribute to the cost of peacekeeping operations in the Middle East and the Congo. The debt now stands at about \$90 million.

KUDOS FOR THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, public support for the Peace Corps continues to be very pronounced throughout the country. Representative of this support is the excellent editorial which appeared in the Idaho Falls Post-Register on July 8. This newspaper, which is one of the largest in my State, is published by Edwin F. McDermott and edited by Robb Brady. The editorial comments on the New York University study which shows the good will built up by the Peace Corps among the people of Colombia. As noted in the editorial:

If the Colombia survey is typical of reactions in other places in the world where the Peace Corps is at work, this face-to-face, shoulder-to-shoulder program may prove to be the best foreign investment (some \$179 million in the past 4 years) this country has ever made.

The dividends in international peace, progress, and understanding could keep coming in for generations.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KUDOS FOR CORPS

The image of the "ugly American" is undergoing a facelift in at least one country.

An investigation by New York University of the impact of the Peace Corps on the people of Colombia shows a rise in pro-American sentiment. The organization has been in this South American nation since the fall of 1961, when 60 volunteers arrived to launch the corps' first rural community development program.

The survey, the first to be made using modern polling techniques, was conducted by Dr. Morris I. Stein, professor of psychology at NYU.

"The results show," he says, "that the volunteers had a positive effect on the people's lives by helping Colombians improve conditions in their communities through such things as sanitation projects and building schools and roads."

Ninety-two percent of the Colombians had favorable attitudes toward the United States. The most frequently given reason was simply that the United States "helps."

If the Colombia survey is typical of reactions in other places in the world where the Peace Corps is at work, this face-to-face, shoulder-to-shoulder program may prove to be the best foreign investment (some \$179 million in the past 4 years) this country has ever made.

The dividends in international peace, progress, and understanding could keep coming in for generations.

DEATH OF NEIL J. CURRY, FORMER PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is a sad week for transportation, for the country, and for the close friends of Neil J. Curry. His sudden passing on Tuesday morning has left those of us who have known him with a sense of shock and with an unfillable void in our hearts. He was not a great man because he was an American but rather was the type of man who made America great. His qualities of leadership, loyalty, and his unbounding devotion to charity and the cause of others were his hallmarks. Whether in business, sports, or on behalf of his country, he lent not only his considerable talents but his unending energies to the task at hand. And more than often these efforts were expended, not in his own behalf, but for the advancement of a principle in which he believed or a cause which needed leadership.

Neil Curry's first love was the trucking industry. He entered the trucking business in 1942 and a short while later formed his own company, California Cartage Co. With the dedication he applied to all his undertakings, he rose rapidly in trucking affairs in his home State of California. He became a director and member of the executive committee and president of the California Trucking Association. His driving spirit soon led him to leadership on the national trucking scene. In 1954 he was elected president of the American Trucking Associations and the following year he was named chairman of the board of directors of the national trade association. But achievement of high position was not his goal. His primary interest was in the betterment of the trucking industry and the advancement of transportation generally. As a tribute to his dedication and contribution, they named him chairman pro tem of the ATA executive committee, a position he held until his untimely death.

While he was, as he once described himself, "first of all a trucker," he also lent his talents to the whole of transportation. He served on the Senate advisory committee studying transport problems; the late President Kennedy named him to be a member of the President's Committee on Traffic Safety on which he remained under President Johnson; he was a director of the Transportation Association of America, a member of the Advisory Committee on Finance of the National Capital Transportation Agency and many other groups.

His sport was horse racing and even in this he rose to the top. With his wife, Connie, he raised thoroughbred horses and became one of the most renowned men in the field. In 1959, Governor Edmund G. Brown, appointed Mr. Curry to be chairman of California's State Horse Racing Board. In 1963 he was chosen to be president of the National Association of State Racing Commissioners and as recently as last month was heralded as the "Horseman of the Year" by the

July 22, 1965

Horsemen's Benevolent & Protective Association.

It would be difficult to relate the events in the life of an ordinary man in these few minutes; it is impossible to review with any thoroughness the many accomplishments of a great man. His achievements in business are documented for all to see but his role as a benefactor is less obvious. Neil Curry sought to help his fellow man not for the glory in it but because he deeply felt their needs. He contributed generously of himself and his funds to aid the poor and the sick and was especially interested in the welfare of children.

He will be sorely missed by those of us who had the good fortune to count him as a close friend. His spirit and memory will live on as an inspiration to all of us.

The effect of Neil Curry's life and unfortunate death is best summed up by the warm tribute paid to him by William A. Bresnahan, managing director of the American Trucking Associations:

The untimely death of Neil J. Curry is a body blow to countless friends and colleagues throughout the country who will mourn his passing.

Those who knew him best, loved him most.

He was a man of many talents and a multitude of interests, but first and last he was a truck man. He enhanced the pride of all the rest of us in the fact that we, too, are truck men. He modestly accepted victory as an expected fruit of effort, and he calmly faced defeat as a signal for redoubled effort.

Those of us who were privileged to work at his side, and to share the victories and defeats, have lost a valiant champion. But most of all we have lost a dear friend.

He walked with kings and never lost the common touch. Now he is gone, suddenly and without warning. He will be sorely missed, but never forgotten. His great spirit will remain as an inspiration to all of us who are left behind to carry on with the work to which he gave the best years of his life.

For as long as there is a trucking industry, the men who fight its battles will speak with reverence of Curry from California.

INFORM THE PUBLIC ABOUT VIETNAM

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, we are all aware that the President and his advisers are meeting now to consider carefully all the factors involved in the war in Vietnam.

Our thoughts and our prayers are with them. To say that the decisions coming out of these discussions will be far-reaching understates the case. Vietnam has assumed an awesome role in the history of the world. What happens in this small country will affect the course of freedom everywhere, in the near future and beyond.

My only regret about the discussions now underway is that they were not held sooner. The basic facts of the situation have not changed. We are faced with the same difficult decisions now which existed months ago.

I am greatly concerned that the seriousness of our position in Vietnam, and its effect on our interests at home and abroad, is not adequately understood by the public at large. It is my sincere hope that as a result of these high-level meetings now underway, the President will

outline as clearly as possible exactly what our aims in Vietnam are and what will likely be required to achieve them. Only if the American people are as fully informed as is possible, consistent with national security, can they be expected to support fully our policy in Vietnam and southeast Asia.

SENATOR CHURCH AND REPRESENTATIVE FORD DISCUSS VIETNAM

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, ABC's fine program, "Issues and Answers," featured as guests on Sunday, July 18, House minority leader, Congressman GERALD FORD, and our colleague, Senator FRANK CHURCH. Senator CHURCH and Congressman FORD were interviewed on the crisis in Vietnam by the distinguished ABC diplomatic correspondent, Mr. John Scali.

While the two guests took differing points of view on the challenge posed by the war in Vietnam, each one presented his views in an articulate and effective manner. Certainly, discussions of this kind help to sharpen our understanding of the vital issues at stake in the Vietnamese struggle.

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the program be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISSUES AND ANSWERS, JULY 18, 1965

Guests: Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, and House minority leader, Representative GERALD FORD, Republican, of Michigan.

Interviewed by: John Scali, ABC diplomatic correspondent.

The ANNOUNCER. Vietnam, No. 1 issue facing America today. How will it end, at the conference table or on the battlefield?

Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, calls for negotiations. Representative GERALD FORD, Republican, of Michigan, demands more bombings.

Are we drifting into world war III over Vietnam? Is Congress split into hawks and doves? Can the President retain bipartisan backing on Vietnam?

For the answers to the issues, Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the House minority leader, Congressman GERALD FORD, of Michigan.

Here to interview Senator CHURCH and Congressman FORD is ABC diplomatic correspondent, John Scali.

Mr. SCALI. Gentleman, welcome to "Issues and Answers."

Let's start off by looking ahead a bit. From all signs, the administration is about to order tens of thousands of additional American combat troops into Vietnam. There is a prospect, I think, that before the end of the year we will have double the 75,000 Americans who were either in Vietnam there now or on the way.

First of all, do you approve of this? Let's begin with Senator CHURCH.

Senator CHURCH. Well, John, I have always held to the position that we can't "cut and run" in southeast Asia. We have committed American prestige, we have made commitments that have to be kept. So I have always supported the position that we should seek a negotiated peace, but we have to stay the course in Vietnam.

Now I think we are at that stage in the war where it will be necessary for us to

demonstrate to Hanoi that we are not going to be driven out of South Vietnam and therefore, I am afraid, that added troops must be sent into the south where the guerrilla war does in fact exist and where the solution has to be found. Now at the end of the monsoon season or after this buildup takes place perhaps then Hanoi will realize that we are there to be reckoned with and then perhaps the prospects will improve for a negotiated settlement.

Mr. SCALI. Congressman FORD, what is your view?

Representative FORD. John, I would say that—the Republicans also agree—the end result must be negotiation. The problem is when you should do it and under what circumstances you should do it.

I think the Congress has a responsibility to await and receive the recommendations of Secretary McNamara and the President himself before making a determination as to whether or not 100,000 more U.S. forces are needed in South Vietnam.

The Congress has the responsibility of asking questions such as: If this additional 100,000 U.S. military personnel are needed there for the purpose of protecting our bases and our personnel that are already there, I am certain, I am positive, that the Congress will give wholehearted endorsement to the request. But I think the Congress also has the responsibility to make certain what our long-range plans are.

Does this mean there is to be a change in the strategy and the tactics? If this means the increase of 100,000 U.S. military personnel there, that we have made the decision to go into a large-scale ground war, then I think the Congress better ask some very pertinent questions of the President and Secretary McNamara.

Mr. SCALI. Senator CHURCH, do you believe that the basic American strategy in Vietnam—at least militarily—should change to allow American troops to spearhead offensive action instead of relying now on the South Vietnamese for this and using American troops as an emergency standby and to guard vital American installations?

Senator CHURCH. I would be satisfied with the present strategy, John, insofar as my personal view is concerned.

I think we have to realize that this is a Vietnamese war. It involves different factions of Vietnamese and the objective of the war is to determine what the political structure of Vietnam is to be. Now that is the kind of war that can only be settled in any durable, satisfactory sense by the Vietnamese, themselves. Therefore, I would hope that we would avoid turning this into an American war. I was out in Asia during the second World War as an officer, in India, Burma, and China, and the one thing I found all Asians had in common was an abiding and deep-seated resentment against the white man, because of the long colonial experience, and if this war becomes a war pitting white Western American forces from the opposite side of the globe against Asians in Asia, then I think that we will never find any durable solution. So I hope our strategy will take this into account.

Representative FORD. John, I would like to add this, and I think it is very, very important: It is true this is a war for the Vietnamese themselves to resolve, and I think they may have to make a bigger effort, but there is a factor that too many people don't realize: there are countries in southeast Asia—the South Koreans, the Philippines, the Australians, the New Zealanders and perhaps others—who have a vital stake in making certain that Communist aggression in all of southeast Asia doesn't overrun them as well as South Vietnam and I think it is very, very important for the administration to maximize its effort in seeking to get bigger commitments, stronger forces, more men to fight

alongside with the South Vietnamese and the U.S. forces.

I feel very strongly that the United States ought to maximize those areas of military power, in the air and on the sea, and we ought to let the South Vietnamese and perhaps the other nations in southeast Asia take advantage of those areas where they have a special competence on the ground.

If we combined these two operations, I am confident that we can convince the Chinese Communists and the Vietcong that it is foolhardy, it is too expensive for them to continue this aggression against South Vietnam.

Senator CHURCH. John, may I just say in that respect, I think the President has for many, many months, been making every effort to secure maximum participation on the part of these other Asian countries. So this has been a task that certainly has not gone unattended and we are getting as much support as these other countries are willing to give. We can't force them in if they are not willing to come. I doubt very much, Jerry, that your proposal, for example, to extend the bombing in the north and to strike the missile bases is a sound one. That is something I think we ought to discuss.

Mr. SCALLI. I would like to discuss that but I am not quite sure, Congressman Ford, how you come down on the position: should American troops be used, in the future, to spearhead offensive operations.

Representative FORD. Well, I am very clear on that, John. At the present time the U.S. military policy is not for the U.S. ground forces to undertake the so-called spearhead operation. The President has informed me personally that this was not our policy. But there is always a possibility that there will be a change and that our ground forces that will be there in substantially greater numbers may adopt new strategy and if this is a change in strategy then I think the President has a responsibility to talk to the legislative leaders in the Congress and perhaps to the American people to inform them the reasons why we have to change our strategy. And I certainly expect to raise questions. If we are going to involve 100,000 200,000 more U.S. Forces on the ground in a jungle, swamp war, why we haven't maximized our utilization of our air power and our sea power.

We are at the present time bombing military installations, significant ones in North Vietnam. I fully approve of that. But, the question is, certainly in my mind, why don't we do more, faster. If this is a way in which we can convince the Vietcong that it is too costly for them to continue their aggression on the ground against the South Vietnamese.

Mr. SCALLI. Then I gather that both of you are satisfied with the present strategy on the ground, which is to rely on the South Vietnamese to spearhead offensive military operations and I gather, if there is a change in this, you would want to discuss it very intensively in Congress?

Senator CHURCH. Let me settle, if I can, this one point. I think, if there is to be a change in strategy, the President will consult fully with the Congress and will take his message to the American people. He has always done that in the past and I am sure he will do it in the future.

(Announcement.)

Mr. SCALLI. Congressman Ford, you have urged and advocated that the United States bomb the Soviet antiaircraft missile sites in the Hanoi area on the ground that these weapons are now a threat to Americans in Vietnam.

On this program last week Secretary Rusk was against this on the grounds that these antiaircraft missiles are not now a threat to Americans.

What do you say in answer to that?

Representative FORD. These surface-to-air missile sites that the Soviet Union has constructed around the Hanoi area in my judg-

ment are significant military targets and I am confident that eventually the administration will take the view that they must be destroyed.

I think it is foolhardy for us to see these missile sites being constructed, made operational, and we do nothing about it until the first American aircraft is shot down and we lose several American pilots in the process.

I would like to go back to what Secretary Rusk said on this program last week. He said there are no sanctuaries in North Vietnam, in Red China. He implied no sanctuaries anywhere.

Mr. SCALLI. That is right.

Representative FORD. In my judgment his statement goes much, much further than anything I have said. He has said by implication if not directly, that any target, civilian or military in North Vietnam or elsewhere, is on the list of targets for the U.S. aircraft and Navy planes. This, I think, is a much, much further extension of military strategy and it opens up the possibility, as far as the Secretary of State is concerned, that civilian targets might well be bombed.

I'd like to ask Senator CHURCH whether he agrees with the Secretary, whether there are no sanctuaries, and does he endorse that position?

Senator CHURCH. Well, I should say first of all that warning the North Vietnamese or the Chinese against stepping up the war and indicating to them that if they do that, they can't expect that we will then respect certain sanctuaries, is a very prudent policy and it is quite different from the recommendation that we should now strike at the missile bases.

I would like to talk about that. Those missile bases are situated around Hanoi. We know the weapon, we know its range, we know its purpose: that is to defend Hanoi against bombing raids.

Now our purpose—up until now—isn't and has never been to strike at the population centers of North Vietnam, to inflict tens of thousands of casualties upon the Vietnamese people. Our purpose in the bombing has been to interdict the supply routes, the supply depots, the railroad centers, the bridges that Hanoi is using to help supply the Vietcong in South Vietnam.

I think that the missile sites, as things now stand, do not interfere with that objective and therefore I see no military reason for striking at these missile bases at the present time.

Now I can see lots of reasons for not doing it. The foremost one is that if we begin to bomb close in to the population centers, we have put the war up another notch. And when we put the war up another notch, then the pressure will be on Ho Chi Minh to do likewise. How is he going to respond? If he can't respond in the air or on the sea, he has to respond on the ground, and he has 300,000 well-trained disciplined troops that have not yet been committed to the war in Vietnam.

Now what are we going to do, JERRY, when he sends those troops southward?

Representative FORD. Are you saying we should wait until the first American aircraft is shot down by one of these missile systems before we do anything to destroy them?

Let me just make this point, if I may.

These five surface-to-air missile systems that are developed around the Hanoi area are quite distinct from the population center of the city of Hanoi itself. We, with our pinpoint bombing, can and have destroyed military targets that are as significant as these without touching any of the civilian population. So it is no excuse for anybody to say that if you bomb the sites you automatically bomb the city of Hanoi. That is an untrue statement.

The sites can be picked off and destroyed without touching a civilian population in the city of Hanoi.

Senator CHURCH. Well, my point is that the sites do not presently interfere with the American bombing mission. It is not at all clear that any of the sites are even within range of the targets we intend to strike. Why, then, further aggravate the situation—and assume a further risk of retaliation—by beginning to bomb close in to the population centers in North Vietnam?

If Ho Chi Minh sends his army south, make no mistake about it, the only thing that will then save Saigon is an immediate and unlimited American intervention on the ground on the scale of the Korean war, and that I thought, JERRY, was the thing you wanted to avoid.

Representative FORD. I certainly do, and I am convinced that if we expedite, if we intensify our air and sea power in South Vietnam, we can convince Ho Chi Minh that it is too costly.

Senator CHURCH. In South Vietnam, yes, but accelerating and expanding the war in the north, as you have suggested, by striking the missile sites will not accomplish that objective.

Representative FORD. I think it will and I am furthermore of the opinion that as the flow of war materiel comes into the ports of Haiphong and otherwise we ought to take some steps to prevent this shipping which is being used to supply Ho Chi Minh and the Vietcong with tons and tons and tons of war materiel.

This is one way to stop his activity. We can do it on the sea and we can do it in the air to a greater degree than we have been doing recently. And my point is that we must use our military superiority, which is in the air and on the sea, in order to avoid, as long as we possibly can, a greater involvement by the United States in a ground war.

Mr. SCALLI. Congressman Ford and Senator CHURCH, what do you think of the argument that we should avoid bombing these Soviet antiaircraft missile sites because at this stage we don't want to kill Russians—meaning perhaps the Russian technicians who are installing and who would be manning these?

Representative FORD. Well it is my judgment, John, that the Soviet Union when it took the initiative to escalate the war by sending their personnel, their military and civilian, that they took a certain risk. And when they are there and they are building a military target, a significant military target in North Vietnam, they undertook a risk which they certainly know that we couldn't let go by indefinitely without taking some military action against them. It just would be pure folly for us to wait until those operational missile systems destroy American aircraft.

Senator CHURCH. I just think that your very question suggests that this is another dimension to the risks we take in striking these missile bases, and since they do not now interfere with our mission in the north, I think that the strategy of the President and his advisers is sound. Under present circumstances, I think it would only increase our risk for general acceleration of the war and accomplish no military objective, to begin striking at these missile bases close to Hanoi.

Mr. SCALLI. Congressman Ford, I gather you think concern over this point should not be a major factor in our decisions on air bombings; is that correct?

Representative FORD. I don't think so because when the Soviet Union took the initiative, supplying materiel and personnel and scientists and technicians to install these military targets, they must have known the risk. They were the ones that escalated the war.

Senator CHURCH. I think this is the chicken-and-the-egg argument. You can go back to our initiation of the bombings in the north and each time we take a step

July 22, 1965

then there is going to be a counterstep. They started the thing a long time ago by moving into South Vietnam. Then there have been countersteps. So the acceleration goes on, on both sides. Now, if you strike the missile bases that doesn't put an end to the situation or solve the problem. What is next? What is the next step: striking Hanoi, bombing China? Where do you draw the line? You have to draw it, I think, at a place that makes sense for the United States of America, and I think that, at this juncture, there is no military need nor any good advantage to be gained by striking the missile bases.

Representative FORD. I am sure you will find there are many, many military people in the Pentagon, in the administration, who would violently disagree with your viewpoint because they feel these missile sites are significant military targets and they ought to be destroyed before they become operational.

Senator CHURCH. They can give their advice and no doubt have, but the prevailing opinion has thus far been against them.

Representative FORD. I think the prevailing opinion, however, of the State Department has overridden some of the military advice in this particular area.

Mr. SCALL. Senator CHURCH, what do you think of Congressman FORD's suggestion that perhaps bombing should be accelerated, more raids against military targets and more planes and just a faster, all-around operation?

Senator CHURCH. Well, I have indicated what I think the risks are. The risks are that North Vietnam will have to retaliate on the ground and then we are in the very kind of mean, widespread jungle war that all of us hope to avoid. I don't know of a single war that has ever been won from the air. It didn't happen in Korea, it didn't happen in Germany. There hasn't been a single case where bombing alone has broken the spirit of resistance, and when an army begins to march, there never has been an instance where that army has been stopped from the air. The only way we will stop the North Vietnamese Army, if it begins to march, is with the introduction of a complete American Army on the ground in South Vietnam.

Mr. SCALL. Congressman FORD, what do you say to that?

Representative FORD. I think your argument is in contradiction, FRANK, to the philosophy and the program and the policy of this administration. Because the President and Secretary McNamara have a schedule of military bombing, aerial attacks against significant military targets, and their whole program is based on the destruction of these significant military targets in North Vietnam.

Now you are raising a—

Senator CHURCH. These missile bases don't fit that category.

Representative FORD. Oh, yes, they are on the schedule.

Senator CHURCH. In what way do they interfere with the interdiction of the supply routes to the south, which is the major reason for our bombing?

Representative FORD. They could, any day. The minute they become operational, and some are operational today, or will be very shortly.

Senator CHURCH. Within a 30-mile range from Hanoi?

Representative FORD. We are already bombing military targets within that area, already. Civilian targets excluded, military targets included. And one of these days there will be a Soviet manned or Soviet trained surface-to-air missile system destroy an American plane and then we will retaliate, and we will have lost one or more American lives and I think this is a risk we don't have to take and we shouldn't take.

Senator CHURCH. If we get involved in a full-scale war in South Vietnam, we will be losing tens of thousands of American lives.

We lost 50,000 Americans in Korea and 150,000 casualties and, at the end, we finished at the bargaining table settling for the status quo, for a stalemate.

Now I hate to see a repeat performance in Vietnam. I think the President is bombing with great restraint and I commend him for that, and I hope he resists the pressures to expand the bombing in North Vietnam because the risks aren't worth the candle.

Representative FORD. But the Secretary of State on this program last week enunciated a policy, which goes beyond anything I have said, or others have said in the Congress. He says there are no sanctuaries, and by implication says that military targets exist every place, not only in North Vietnam but in China, itself.

Mr. SCALL. Gentlemen, we will resume this discussion in just a moment when we will be back with more "Issues and Answers."

(Announcement.)

Mr. SCALL. Gentlemen, there are signs that President Johnson may have to call up reserves in order to send more troops into Vietnam. How do you stand on this, Senator CHURCH?

Senator CHURCH. I think I have already indicated that in the answer to the first question, that this is a stage in the war where we have to demonstrate that we are in South Vietnam and we won't be driven out, and when Hanoi realizes this, then I think we can look forward to a satisfactory basis for a negotiated settlement. But the war exists in South Vietnam, and a solution will have to be found there, not in North Vietnam, not in China, or elsewhere. Not in an expanded war, which is the way in, but by concentrating in the south, which is—ultimately—the way out.

Representative FORD. Well, John, as you know, I strongly feel that we must stay there and prevent Communist aggression against free nations of the world.

The question of whether or not the President ought to call up reserves to active duty, extend the enlistments of others, is one the Congress ought to look at very, very carefully.

Last week, I was at a meeting with the Secretary of Defense, and he was telling us that this administration has increased the counterinsurgency forces by a thousand percent. We have increased the combat-ready divisions from 11 to 15. It seems to me that before we give carte blanche authority to the President to call up reservists we ought to look and see whether these programs of the President in strengthening our armed forces have been adequate.

Mr. SCALL. Thank you very much, gentlemen, for being with us today on "Issues and Answers."

The ANNOUNCER. Our guests this week have been Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, and House Minority Leader GERALD FORD, Republican, of Michigan. They were interviewed by ABC State Department Correspondent John Scall.

Next week at this same time the American Broadcasting Co. will bring you another program of "Issues and Answers." We hope you will be with us.

LOAN AND SALE OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on April 27, 1965, the Secretary of the Navy submitted to the Congress recommendations for the enactment of three bills: First, to lend one destroyer and two destroyer escorts to China, two destroyers to Turkey and one destroyer escort to the Philippines; second, to lend two submarines to Italy and one helicopter car-

rier to Spain; and, third, to sell or lend three destroyers to Argentina, four destroyers to Brazil, two destroyers each to Chile and Peru and one submarine to Venezuela.

These bills have been reported favorably by the House Armed Services Committee. They are now pending before the Senate Armed Services Committee. Also pending before that committee is a bill introduced by Senator RUSSELL on July 15, providing for the loan of one helicopter carrier to Spain and two destroyers to Turkey which presumably is to take the place of the first two bills previously mentioned.

The Committee on Foreign Relations is naturally deeply interested in the military assistance program. Since these loans and sales of naval vessels sometimes involve U.S. funds derived from the military assistance program and since, in the words of the Secretary of the Navy, these loans and sales are "related to the mutual defense and development program," I wrote the Secretary of Defense on May 21, 1965, and asked for a report on this program. Mr. Peter Solbert, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, replied by letter of June 16, 1965. He described the terms of the loans and sales made under this program which has involved the outright grant of 9 destroyer escorts, the sale of a submarine to Venezuela and the loan of 71 ships to 18 countries since the inception of the program in 1951.

This is not the same program as the loan of naval vessels not larger than destroyers to friendly foreign nations in the Far East and Europe under the authority of Public Law 83-188 as amended by Public Law 84-948. Loan agreements under this authority can be extended under the authority of section 503 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. The Department of State is now in the process of exchanging notes with the Japanese Government extending for 5 years the loan of seven U.S. minesweepers which were originally turned over to the Japanese in January 1955 under the authority of Public Law 83-188. The committee has received two letters, dated June 14 and July 19, from Mr. John Funari, Legislative Programs Coordinator of the Agency for International Development, regarding these negotiations with the Japanese Government. Mr. Funari points out that title to the ships remains in the U.S. Government. He states that it is his belief that the transfer of these minesweepers was, and still is, a loan and not a grant and that therefore the extension of the loan should not be construed as conflicting with section 620(m) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 which prohibits assistance on a grant basis to any economically developed nation.

I believe the Members of the Senate will be interested in reading the letters from Mr. Solbert and Mr. Funari, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

July 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17249

At this time I ask consent to include these editorials in their entirety in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 21, 1965]

GOLDBERG TO THE U.N.
(By Roscoe Drummond)

APPOINTMENT CALLED SUPERB

President Johnson has chosen a man as nearly as possible in the image and likeness of Adlai E. Stevenson to succeed him as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

In my judgment the President has chosen very well indeed.

Of Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, who is willing to give up a lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court because of his dedication to the U.N. and his sense of duty to the President, Mr. Stevenson's sister, Mrs. Elizabeth Ives, said: "He understood Adlai and his aims."

He also understands the aims, and hopes and—as in Vietnam—the courage of the American people.

The significant fact is that Goldberg has qualifications in the field of foreign affairs which would not be immediately visible from the record of his public service—a distinguished and respected labor lawyer, one of the best Secretaries of Labor the Nation ever had and Supreme Court Justice.

I offer a pertinent appraisal of Goldberg from one who during the past decade has known well more men in public life than most any other American.

Soon after the 1960 election, when he was writing his book, "Six Crises," and President-elect Kennedy was selecting the top people in his administration, Vice President Nixon remarked to one of his closest collaborators:

"Many of these same men would have been in my Cabinet, if I had been elected. But I would not have made Arthur Goldberg Secretary of Labor. I would have made him Under Secretary of State."

Nixon's judgment was that Goldberg deeply understood the issues and pitfalls of the cold war and would not be misled by surface developments.

Since becoming a member of the Court, Justice Goldberg has traveled widely abroad to speak before jurists and has become personally acquainted with a considerable number of world leaders.

It is unusual for a President to turn to the Supreme Court for an appointment of this kind. But Mr. Johnson does not blanch at the unusual and his decision reflects his high regard for the United Nations and his hope that its capacity to keep the peace can be strengthened.

It is evident that the President had this prescription in mind as he searched for Adlai's successor:

He wanted a man who had already attained public stature.

He wanted a man who had some of his own credentials to speak for his Government and who would not have to rely wholly on the credentials which come from the position.

He wanted a man deeply devoted to the cause of world peace whose very presence at the U.N. would underline the President's own dedication in trying to bring about both peace and justice under the rule of law.

From my knowledge of Justice Goldberg, I would say that he hates war and believes that the failure to resist aggression is the most likely way of getting into war.

This is the viewpoint he will, I think, bring to the councils of the administration. As with Adlai, he will be a member of the Cabinet and at the center of U.S. foreign policy formulation. He will be a source of

strength—as well as unity—to the administration team of Rusk, McNamara and McGeorge Bundy.

No one in our time can fill Adlai's place. He was unique.

But in Justice Goldberg the President has not only made a surprise appointment but a superb one.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 20, 1965]

GOLDBERG APPOINTMENT HAILED
(By David Lawrence)

President Johnson made a wise choice in selecting Associate Justice Arthur J. Goldberg of the Supreme Court to become U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to replace the late Adlai Stevenson. The President recognized the need for a man of national and international stature—someone who could carry on extemporaneous debate in the United Nations General Assembly or the Security Council and make an effective impression with his words.

Another basic reason for Johnson's decision undoubtedly was Goldberg's keen perception of the many legal questions that affect governments throughout the world today in their relations with each other.

Goldberg has spoken often before national and international law organizations here and abroad. While the United Nations has among its ambassadors from other countries men who are versed in diplomacy, some of those who have proved most effective in the past had a deep insight into international law.

Goldberg's appointment could result in a new emphasis on law in the councils of the United Nations. This would be a significant change. Johnson said he had asked the Justice to serve because there was no more important task ahead today than the achievement of "a world where all men may live in peace with the hope of justice under the rule of law." He added:

"Committed as we are to this principle and to this purpose, it is fitting that we should ask a member of our highest court to relinquish that office to speak for America before the nations of the world."

Also, in the area of mediation and negotiation, Goldberg will bring to his new task an ability which he used successfully as a labor lawyer. Many labor lawyers naturally become masters of a kind of diplomacy in dealing with labor-management disputes which enables them in many cases to end strikes or to prevent them. They use well-balanced phrases in proposed agreements that must meet the tests of public opinion both inside and outside of the labor unions.

Goldberg's willingness to leave the Supreme Court has caused many Members of Congress to wonder why he would abandon a lifetime position for something else in Government. But there are some men who find that, while the service of a Supreme Court Justice is intensely interesting, there are in critical times other fields to which duty calls them.

James F. Byrnes, for example, had been Governor of the State of South Carolina and has served also in the Senate before President Roosevelt appointed him to the Supreme Court of the United States in June 1941. But when war broke out, Byrnes was called in October 1942, to take over the job of Director of Economic Stabilization and then was appointed Director of War Mobilization in May 1943. There was talk of nominating him for Vice President in 1944 instead of Harry S. Truman. Upon becoming President, the latter appointed Byrnes as Secretary of State, a post in which he served effectively in a critical period in American history.

Goldberg, in reaching his decision to leave the Supreme Court, may just possibly have thought that, with only a few years of service in the United Nations, he could achieve a position which would entitle him to consid-

eration for a higher office in the country. Seven years hence, it would not be at all surprising to find him active in politics if he has made a good record in the United Nations and the country has come to know him through the numerous exposures he will have on TV. It will be recalled that in 1960 Henry Cabot Lodge, while serving as Ambassador to the United Nations, was nominated for the Vice Presidency by the Republican Convention.

Goldberg's previous identification with the labor movement could be an important asset. Not only was he general counsel of the United Steelworkers Union—winning the respect of many of the men on the management side of the steel industry—but he also was able in his post as Secretary of Labor in President Kennedy's Cabinet to make his influence felt even further. This is a background which can be useful to him in his new post in the United Nations. For in many countries the labor problem has become more and more significant in its relation to National Government policies.

On the whole, it would seem apparent that, since there was no one sufficiently outstanding on the diplomatic side to impress foreign governments, Johnson came to the conclusion that he could add to the prestige of the United States at the United Nations by selecting a man from the highest Court in the land.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 21, 1965]

THE INEVITABLE CHOICE—THE MAN, JOB GO TOGETHER

(By Mary McGrory)

Now that Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg has been named Ambassador to the United Nations, he seems not just the only possible choice, but inevitable. No man has a greater reputation for inducing the lion and the lamb to lie down together.

The exuberant gregarious Justice knows everybody in the Government and everybody knows him. He has no better friend in the White House than President Johnson. Actually the first person to mention his name to the President was the Harvard economist, author, and erstwhile Ambassador to India, John Kenneth Galbraith.

Galbraith went to call at the White House last Friday after Adlai Stevenson's memorial service at the National Cathedral. He proposed to the President that what was needed in the United Nations job was "someone who knows the mood of the American people, and someone with standing in the United States. Diplomatic experts are a dime a dozen," he said.

The President considered 20 to 35 prominent Americans for the post, and he talked to many people over the past few days before making his final selection.

The President called Goldberg some time on Saturday to sound him out on the possibility of succeeding Stevenson on the East River. The Justice assured the President he could not refuse to do whatever Johnson asked him to. But for a poor Jewish boy from the West Side of Chicago, who helped his father, a fruit-wagon peddler, the Supreme Court represented a dream come true, and he was truly torn.

The Justice by Saturday night had asked an old friend about the possibility of serving with him on the U.N. staff.

His friends have claimed that "Arthur cannot stand to be away from the action," and that he chafed at the monastery atmosphere of the High Court. He visibly fretted during its long vacations.

When President Kennedy appointed him to the Supreme Court in August 1962, and named Willard Wirtz as his successor as Secretary of Labor, Goldberg and Wirtz held the most rapturous press conference in Capital annals. And while on the Court, although he interested himself in any num-

17250

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 22, 1965

ber of other projects and was called in by two Presidents to use his matchless talents as a negotiator, he was a most meticulous and dedicated member.

The regret he expressed at his press conference yesterday was genuine.

But he never doubted that he would take the ambassadorship once it was offered. The President, having broached the matter, suggested that he and the Justice could discuss it fully on the plane on the way to Stevenson's funeral service in Bloomington on Monday.

The President talked Monday afternoon with Secretary of State Dean Rusk while Rusk was in New York for U.N. memorial services for Stevenson, and Rusk felt very favorable toward the suggestion that Goldberg get the assignment.

At 10 Monday night, Goldberg got a call at George Washington Hospital, where he and Mrs. Goldberg were visiting the latter's 82-year-old mother, Mrs. Louis Kurgans, ill of a heart condition. The call was from the President, and it made pretty plain that Goldberg was the choice for Stevenson's shoes.

Then the final call to Goldberg at 9:57 yesterday morning, formally tapping him. The President said:

"I want you. Bring Mrs. Goldberg right on down to the office."

It was done, and the appointment was announced to the Nation.

CHOICE ACCLAIMED

The choice was immediately acclaimed. The matter of his inexperience in formal diplomatic dealings was brushed aside by the President's staff and by members of the press who have watched the justice in deadlock situations. Even the Arabs, whose resentment over the naming of a Jew to the world forum was anticipated, are expected to yield to the persistent Goldberg charm.

He is a natural to settle the strike of the roadies payers, France and the Soviet Union. He settled more strikes than any Secretary of Labor in American history.

He confided his formula to a reporter just before he went into action on the Metropolitan Opera strike in answer to a soprano plea from Leontyne Price: Find out the facts; hear out both sides; get in responsible people who can make decisions; look for somebody in the entourages who can be talked to; search for mutual friends on the outside.

People who were a week ago predicting the demise of the United Nations, are just as surely predicting today that Goldberg will bring it back to life. When Goldberg puts his mind to article 19 and sets about persuading the debtors—or finding a face-saving exit for the other nations—something will give. It always has. During the airline strike in the winter of 1961, during a 4-month deadlock, he made himself available around the clock to the contesting parties. He surely will do the same among the nations.

ALWAYS AT HIGH NOON

He is a man of infinite resourcefulness and unrelenting good cheer. If Stevenson's personality had a dappled-sunlight quality, Goldberg's clock is always at high noon. He believes simply that there is no situation beyond solution. And he shares with Stevenson, according to Wirtz, a good friend of both, capacity of infinite interest in whatever is going on at the moment.

Against his dismay at deserting his colleagues on the High Court, is balanced his oft-expressed feeling that all domestic problems are subsidiary to the questions of war and peace.

Now through an appointment that has brought Johnson more huzzahs than any he has made so far, he can become mediator to the world.

If any man can enjoy the job, it will be Arthur Goldberg.

AERIAL BOMBING AGGRAVATES GUERRILLA WAR

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, some Republican "air hawks" urge more bombing as a solution to our problems in Vietnam. But, as any student of guerrilla war knows, aerial bombing is much like swatting at gnats with a sledge hammer. Often, the result is that more innocent villagers are killed than enemy soldiers. The crucial struggle in a guerrilla war is to win the support of the people; in such a war, a rifle is a much more suitable weapon than a plane.

I worry that we may be making the same mistake that the French did in the first Indochinese war. By killing innocent villagers through the careless use of air power and artillery, the French turned the surviving relatives and friends into supporters of Ho Chi Minh's rebels.

An article by John T. Wheeler calling attention to this problem was published by the Washington Post on July 19. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOMBS KILL VIET VILLAGE INNOCENTS

(By John T. Wheeler)

BAGIA, SOUTH VIETNAM, July 18.—The walling of women and the stench of burned bodies greeted the column of troops as they marched wearily into Bagia.

They were searching for a Vietcong force which earlier had overrun a nearby government strongpoint. It turned out the search was fruitless.

Four men carrying a pallet with a wounded man stared hatefully at American advisers accompanying the Vietnamese marines and the cries of a woman sitting in the middle of a dirt road cradling a baby and flanked by two other small children caused some of the Vietnamese troops to turn aside.

Surveying the shattered stucco and bamboo homes and the machinegunned Catholic church, one U.S. adviser said:

"That's why we are going to lose this stupid damn war. Senseless, it's just senseless."

Bagia, with a high percentage of Catholics, was considered a pro-government village. It was hit 3 days running with bombs, rockets, and cannon fire from American and Vietnamese fighter bombers.

The first time was after the nearby outpost, headquarters of the 51st Regiment was overrun by the Vietcong and two 105-millimeter howitzers were taken. The second time was following a rebel attack the next night.

The third, as an American Air Force officer expressed it, was an insurance measure to clear the way for government troops moving back into the area in a sweep to try to catch the Vietcong.

The sweep was launched some 24 hours after the Vietcong regiment had pulled out of the area, one American adviser said later.

Because the 51st Regiment was under strength due to previous maulings at the hands of the Vietcong and because Vietnamese troops normally fail to patrol aggressively and set out night ambushes, the Vietcong had been able to come into the village in strength.

The villagers risked torture and death if they tried to warn the outpost, so Bagia like countless other villages in Vietnam, was caught in the middle and paid a terrible

price, not for its politics but for its physical location.

Asked how many had been killed and wounded, villagers shrugged and replied "many."

On the floor of one home was a can of cottonseed cooking oil with the clasped hands emblem of the U.S. aid program. Nearby was a destroyed schoolhouse which villagers said had been only recently built, presumably with American aid money.

"The Americans have given and the Americans have taken away," one U.S. Army adviser said later in describing the situation.

In explaining the bombing, a U.S. Air Force officer said: "When we are in a bind like we were at Bagia, we unload on the whole area to try to save the situation. We usually kill more women and kids than we do Vietcong but the government troops just aren't available to clean out the villages so this is the only answer."

A U.S. Air Force spokesman at Saigon, commenting on air strikes in general, pointed out that targets are selected by Vietnamese commanders and that American strikes are only fulfilling requests from an ally.

PROGRESS OF BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROGRAM

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, nearly 6 months ago, the President announced a program of action for reducing the continued large deficit in this country's balance of international payments. This program included, in addition to certain fiscal measures to be followed by the Government, requests for voluntary action by lenders, investors, and others to reduce the flow of dollars abroad.

During March, following the announcement of this program, the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee held a series of hearings on the problems of the country's balance of payments. These hearings included statements by responsible Government officials, by representatives of banking and business, and by economists. The proceedings, together with other analyses of various aspects of the problem, were published by the committee.

Another hearing was conducted in May, and others are being scheduled beginning August 3, and again on August 17, to review progress of the program and other developments since March, and to consider problems that may lie ahead. These hearings will include statements by the Secretary of Commerce, by a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, by other businessmen and bankers, and in conclusion, by the Secretary of the Treasury, who will testify August 18.

Recently a number of statements have been made by officials and businessmen as to the progress of the program. I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of my remarks, there be inserted in the RECORD the following speeches: "Investment Planning, Financing Abroad, and the U.S. Balance-of-Payments Program," by Andrew F. Brimmer, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs, before the New York Society of Security Analysts, Inc., July 15, 1965; "The Stake of U.S. Business in the Voluntary Balance-of-Payments Program," by Albert L. Nickerson, chairman of the board of directors, Socony Mobil Oil Co.,

July 22, 1965

17243

sion, submerges drama in endless hours of padded programing.

The TV spectator is left nodding in front of his set and the delegates, weary and sweaty, find themselves serving as extras in a television production—sitting on a convention floor behind a battery of electronic eyes which see what is going on while the delegates are in utter bafflement.

If the modern convention has any of the fascination that H. L. Mencken once saw, it can only be that of the horror sideshow.

Mr. President, turning now to the electoral college, we find an even more timely area of reform. If there can be said to be general public acceptance of the "one-man, one-vote" theory, it can be said that public desire for a change in the electoral college system is even greater and of longer duration.

Three times in history—Adams in 1924, Hayes in 1876, and Harrison in 1888—that the electoral college system has elevated to the highest office in the land candidates who received fewer popular votes than their leading opponents.

Providentially, the Nation has sailed on. But the spectre of abuse still hangs over the system. It is hardly an example of democracy in action to have voters cast 49 percent of the vote for a particular candidate and find that, because their candidate did not receive a majority, their votes count for nothing because of the use of the present system.

The Founding Fathers, of course, contrived the electoral college to retard the danger of excesses in popular rule. Today, when education is a major national goal, there is a well-founded belief in the capacity of a free people to render sound judgments—a belief which must therefore reject the electoral college principle.

If my amendment is enacted, the people will have a direct voice—the candidate who gets 49 percent of the electoral vote will be the man who received 49 percent of the popular vote.

It will change the system in accordance with other recent constitutional amendments—all of which have been intended to further extend the franchise on a broader basis.

The movement to enlarge the voting privilege was bolstered in 1870 with the 15th amendment, assuring the right to vote regardless of race or color; with the 17th amendment in 1913, which provided for popular election of Senators; with the 19th amendment in 1920, which provided suffrage for women; with the 23d amendment in 1960, which gave to the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President, and the 24th amendment, authored by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], which last year abolished the use of the poll tax in Federal elections.

Each of these established within the framework of the Constitution legitimate expansion and protection of the right to vote. And I might say, parenthetically, that this is the right and proper course for all legislative effort dealing with the franchise. It was only

because the recently passed voting rights bill collided with the Constitution that I regretfully opposed it; not because I am against laws to prevent discrimination against all persons who want to register and vote.

If, however, we are to subscribe in full measure to popular government we should use the Constitution as the proper vehicle to extend to the people the unfettered right to select those who hold high office and who make and enforce our laws.

The Congress has moved to correct, via the Constitution, the deficiency which beclouds the problem of Presidential inability. When the State legislatures of these United States act, our Constitution will be amended so that this Nation need no longer agonize over the incapacity of the President—as happened for more than 80 days during President Garfield's term, for some 16 months during President Wilson's service and on two occasions when President Eisenhower was in the White House.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am hopeful that Congress will delay no longer on these other needed reforms.

In his state of the Union message of January 7, 1965, President Johnson unequivocally advocated reforms in the electoral college. Former President Harry S. Truman endorsed national primaries and more recently former President Dwight D. Eisenhower has also criticized the national nominating convention procedure.

By acting on these reforms now and sending them to the States for ratification, Congress will have thwarted any preemption of its powers by another branch of Government. The record will have been set straight.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the Record at this point an editorial from the July 2, 1965, edition of the Washington Post entitled "Obsolete Electoral System."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OBsolete Electoral System

An interesting challenge to the present method of electing the President is taking shape as a result of the Supreme Court's one-man-one-vote ruling in the apportionment cases. Projecting the reasoning of the Court into the presidential elector system, some lawyers have concluded that there is no constitutional justification for the practice of giving all of a State's electoral votes to the presidential candidate winning a majority of the popular vote in that State. The challenge is to be carried to the Supreme Court.

One suit is being prepared in Arkansas. A group of Republicans in that State will contend that they are disfranchised because the "general ticket system" has given all of Arkansas' electoral votes to the Democratic candidate in every election since the Civil War. Republican votes in Arkansas, they say, never count for anything in the election of the President.

Another attack will come from Delaware. There the argument is that the "general ticket system" gives an unfair advantage to the big States with large blocs of electoral votes. In a case before the Supreme Court some months ago, Justice Brennan remarked that a legislative districting plan might be

unconstitutional if it should minimize or cancel out the voting strength of racial or political elements of the voting population. This is said to be what the "general ticket system" does in presidential elections.

In our view the possibility that the Court might intervene to upset the general ticket system is remote. The Constitution is very specific in authorizing each State to appoint its presidential electors "in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct." Nevertheless, these challenges to the existing system are significant for two reasons. First, they emphasize the many deviations from the one-man-one-vote concept in our constitutional system, thus perhaps encouraging Congress to go forward with its proposed amendment to restore to the States the right of distributing seats in one house of their legislatures on the basis of political units rather than population. Second, they center attention once more on the necessity of reforming our presidential election machinery.

Last January the Johnson administration introduced a proposed constitutional amendment to abolish the electoral college and let the people vote directly for presidential and vice-presidential candidates. Those receiving a majority vote in each State would carry the electoral votes of that State. Not much has since been heard of this proposal. Although it has some serious technical defects, it would have the virtue of eliminating the electors, who may sometimes be in a position to thwart the will of the voters in the naming of the President.

The best way to attack our obsolete presidential election system is through the amendment process rather than through the courts.

Felton Church
EDITORIAL BY DRURY BROWN
ON VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one of Idaho's newspaper publishers who has made a real effort to learn about the issues involved in the Vietnamese conflict is Drury Brown, the editor and publisher of the Blackfoot, Idaho, News. Mr. Brown has run a series of thoughtful editorials on Vietnam, including one entitled "The Escalating Viet War," published in the July 12 issue. I ask unanimous consent to have this provocative editorial printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE ESCALATING VIET WAR (Editorial by Drury Brown)

When one sifts the many conflicting statements by spokesmen for the Johnson administration, the achievement of stalemate in the war in South Vietnam seems to be the prime objective agreed on by the consensus.

There still appear to be certain ground rules governing the steady expansion of the undeclared war. Not necessarily in the order of their importance they are:

1. The people of the United States would not support another Korea-like ground war in the jungles of Vietnam.

2. The honor of the United States is at stake. We are committed to protect the people of South Vietnam, a nation that was created at the end of the French Vietnamese war by the big nations that sat in on the peace treaty at its conclusion. South Vietnam was arbitrarily created to provide a haven for the minority of French-oriented Vietnamese at the conclusion of the war of revolution. (It was as artificial a division as that which divided East and West Germany at the conclusion of World War II.) Then we

and other signatories to the treaty guaranteed protection to South Vietnam.

3. As long as the North Vietnam invaders think they are winning the war it will be impossible to negotiate an honorable peace with them.

4. By applying airpower, in which we are supreme, to bombing of guerrilla jungle installations, to supply routes, bridges, depots, and troop encampments in North Vietnam, we may force the invaders to conclude that the game isn't worth the candle and they will become willing to negotiate.

5. Once convinced there is no future in subversion, the entire population of South Vietnam will turn to sweet reasonableness and will in democratic elections elect a civilian government that will represent all the people but will still be anti-Communist.

6. To achieve these objectives it will be necessary to keep the U.S. casualty lists low, but at the same time feed enough U.S. marines and other ground fighters into battle to be sure that our reluctant Vietnamese allies do not give away before the attacks of the more spirited and determined Cong.

I hope these apparent objectives represent the inner thinking of the administration. And that the administration will hold to them. But there are disturbing signs that events, which have moved the administration from previously announced positions will continue to do the same in the future.

Let those who think we cannot be escalated into a major war over Vietnam consider these items.

Half the budget items provided by the Associated Press wire service yesterday dealt with the Vietnam situation. As is customary of news from the scene of fighting, our air successes in shooting down opposition planes was emphasized. But the report on ground fighting told of the Vietcong smashing a South Viet convoy in territory considered safe for our ally. The Lodge-Taylor shift indicates all is not well on the diplomatic front. The new South Viet leaders say a civilian legislature would be unrealistic. The boss of home mobilization in case of war says the United States is prepared to its last bootstrap for any emergency.

It is unfortunate that the ground rules covering the war we are waging in Vietnam are based on so many fallacies.

Under the leadership of John Foster Dulles we helped create the artificial division of South Vietnam against the wishes of a majority of the people, both North and South. Our participation in the war is unpopular with other guarantors of South Vietnam. Only Australia has contributed a token handful of troops to fight beside us.

Diem, the puppet ruler that we set up knew that his government was unpopular and would not survive a democratic election. Therefore one was never held.

Our years of military and economic support to South Vietnam have built up a fat and enriched class of officials in Saigon who are reluctant to fight for themselves, but spend their time intriguing for higher position and self-preservation. Meanwhile, they draft the farm boys and Montagnards to do the fighting and dying in the jungles, secure in the knowledge that the anti-Communist sentiment that has been the key to U.S. foreign policy will not let them be overturned.

It is unfortunate that people in the United States do not understand that Ho Chi Minh, leader of the Vietnamese revolutionaries that threw the French out, is a hero to most of the people of South Vietnam.

Few South Vietnamese outside Saigon and a few coastal cities have anything to be thankful for to the United States. Through our presence there they have found neither peace nor an improved condition of living. Their impression of the United States has been formed by the bombers flying overhead, the napalm bombs dropped on jungle vil-

lages; the regimentation imposed by whatever government was in the saddle in Saigon.

But once committed to a foreign policy, it has been rare for any major government to admit its policy is based on mistaken premises.

And there is within the United States today a vocal minority of ideological zealots, who like the religious zealots of other centuries, would prosecute a war against anything with a Communist tag, regardless of what a majority of the people involved might desire.

THE OMNIBUS FARM BILL AND THE PROPOSED REPEAL OF THE RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, according to news reports in two South Carolina newspapers, The State, of Columbia, S.C., and the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY are currently engaged in trying to employ the tactic of political coercion on Members of Congress who represent States which have farming interests. According to these news reports, what they are attempting to do is to force farm-State Congressmen to support the President's effort to repeal State right-to-work laws in exchange for getting a farm bill passed by the Congress this year. These Congressmen have been bluntly told by Vice President HUMPHREY that unless enough of them vote to insure repeal of the State right-to-work laws, there may be no omnibus farm bill which carries, in addition to various farm legislative items, the continuation of the one-price cotton system which is of interest to the domestic textile industry.

The President even plans to call up the right-to-work law for action in the House of Representatives before the farm bill is acted on with the hope of coercing the farm-State Congressmen into supporting his efforts to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes State right-to-work laws.

Indications are strong, however, that most of our southern Congressmen and also our domestic textile industry are going to stand by their position in favor of State right-to-work laws. This is as it should be, and I am confident that our farm population will agree that such a brash tactic as political intimidation should not be permitted to succeed under any circumstances.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the following articles: an article from The State, dated July 17, 1965, and entitled "Dixie Solons May Have To Back Right-To-Work Repeal"; another article from The State, dated July 21, 1965, an entitled "Right-To-Work Laws Fight: No Compromise Seen"; an article from the Greenville News, dated July 17, 1965, and entitled "Rural Congressmen Put On Spot: H.H.H. Ties In Farm Bill, Right-To-Work Repeal"; another article from the Greenville News, dated July 20, 1965, entitled "Reports Confirmed: L.B.J. Seeks Coalition To Pass New Labor Bill"; and an editorial entitled "There's

a Word for This," published in the Atlanta Times of July 20, 1965.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The State, Columbia, S.C., July 17, 1965]

DIXIE SOLONS MAY HAVE TO BACK RIGHT-TO-WORK REPEAL

WASHINGTON.—Southern Congressmen were told Friday that they may have to drop their opposition to the repeal of the right-to-work provision (14-B) of the Taft-Hartley Act if they want a farm bill this year.

That word came directly from Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY during a breakfast meeting arranged by the Agriculture Department through House Agriculture Committee Chairman HAROLD COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina.

The session was called for the purpose of briefing the lawmakers on the provisions of the omnibus farm measure put together earlier this week by the House committee. It embraces a 4-year extension on the one-price cotton program sought by growers and the Dixie textile industry.

But HUMPHREY, in backing the bill as essential to the farm economy, reportedly made a point of stressing it couldn't pass without the help of a lot of city Congressmen, including those from heavy labor districts.

And he made it clear they would expect to be paid back with support for legislation they want.

He said this was one of the legislative facts of life and, according to some of those present, left no doubt in anybody's mind that the repeal of the right-to-work law, which labor is seeking would be one of the areas in which the payoff would be expected.

About 50 House Members, mostly from the South and Midwest, were invited to the session.

Among the States represented were the Carolinas, Georgia, and Florida—all right-to-work States. Early indications have been that most of their delegation members planned to vote against the 14-B repeal.

Even as the meeting was held, there were indications that a race might develop between the farm and labor blocs to see which measure can be brought to the floor first.

The farm bill is due to go to the House Rules Committee about the middle of next week for consideration.

That same committee, dominated by Chairman HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia, is currently sitting on the right-to-work repeal plan but cannot hold it beyond next Friday under the 21-day rule now in effect.

Thus, it will probably rest which of the two bills come out first for floor debate and—if the vote swapping develops—who is going to have to make the initial payoff.

[From the State, Columbia, S.C., July 21, 1965]

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS FIGHT—NO COMPROMISE SEEN

WASHINGTON.—U.S. Representative JOHN L. McMILLAN predicted Tuesday that southern Congressmen would steadfastly refuse to compromise their opposition to the proposed elimination of State right-to-work laws.

The South Carolinian said pressure is growing on the Dixie bloc in the House to support repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act in exchange for the backing of urban members on the omnibus farm bill.

McMILLAN, a member of the House Agriculture Committee which hammered out the farm package as it now stands, said most southerners are too strongly committed on the right-to-work issue to switch their positions.

He pointed out that 82 percent of the U.S. Representatives come from big-city areas and

road money, for any city that seeks new funds without such a plan. Those cities affected include New York, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Omaha, Shreveport, and San Francisco.

The Bureau has estimated that the program will cost \$5.8 billion more than the \$41 billion previously forecast. Increased revenues will bring in an added \$2 billion to the trust fund through 1972, the Bureau says, but an additional \$3 billion in Federal money is needed to meet increased costs.

Because Interstate System costs are already outstripping revenues, the quarterly apportionment set by the Bureau for the States last August was not released until last month, 3 months behind schedule.

Should the House Ways and Means Committee fail to enact legislation increasing taxes for the program until 1966, another 3-month delay in appropriations could result. This is slowing work in some of the more advanced States.

The House committee, which may hold hearings on the matter later this month, is reported reluctant to raise truck taxes.

Highway sources report that the committee might propose a patchwork tax program, including an extension of the tax period and use of 1 percent of the automobile excise tax to finance the added costs.

STRETCHOUT OF PROGRAM

Alfred E. Johnson, executive secretary of the American Association of State Highway Officials, estimates that failure to obtain the \$3 billion in added money would amount to a 1-year program stretchout.

The prospect of a stretched out interstate program does not appeal to State highway officials and contractors, who would face layoffs and reduced operations. They want to keep the project going full blast, and to follow it up with another massive road program.

Most experts agree future spending should be concentrated in urban areas. There is also considerable sentiment for standardizing the Federal share of Federal-aid highway projects at around 65 to 70 percent of costs.

The Government's share of federally aided road programs normally was 50 percent before the interstate project, and the Government continues to spend only 50 percent on most of its noninterstate road programs.

JOHNSON APPROACH

There are serious misgivings within the Johnson administration, however, about the propriety of this approach to determining transportation needs. Some transportation experts within the administration favor a comprehensive study of the proper balance of funds that should go into all modes of transportation.

Most transportation experts here believe that Alan S. Boyd, named last month as Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, has been given a mandate by President Johnson to put transportation spending on a more rational basis.

Such a move, in the view of most economists, would include cost-benefit studies, which weigh spending against the value derived from it.

"I can assure you that we're going to build roads on the basis of cost-benefit studies, which I hope will be the logical and rational approach to it," Mr. Boyd has stated.

Most sources believe President Johnson to be an ardent Interstate System supporter. They doubt that he would shape any policy to bring about a sharp dispute with the strong petroleum, automobile, trucking, and construction interests in the road lobby.

For the President
VIETNAM—THE IMPORTANCE OF
MAINTAINING A LARGE AND
READY MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, recent difficulties involving the shipment

of vital war material to Vietnam have pointed up, once again, the importance to our national security of maintaining a large and ready merchant marine.

Last week the Department of Defense embarked upon a program of reactivating vessels from the U.S. Reserve Fleet. These reactivated vessels will be used to transport defense cargo to southeast Asia.

This emergency action contains several lessons for those concerned with maritime policy. First, some of the shipyards contacted about the work necessary to reactivate the older ships have reported that, due to the decline in the industry, skilled workers are simply not available. As a result, the reactivation of these vessels might be delayed. The necessity of maintaining a strong shipbuilding industry could hardly be more dramatically illustrated.

Second, newspaper reports indicate a shortage of qualified engineers to man these ships. It is apparent that a fleet which has fewer and fewer vessels under American flags will find difficulty in retaining a sufficient number of qualified seamen. This is precisely the situation in the American fleet.

The U.S. merchant marine numbered over 2,300 vessels at the end of the Second World War. It ranked as the world's leading maritime power. Today, the fleet has shrunk to barely 900 vessels. This country ranks fourth in the free world—and may soon be surpassed by the Soviet Union as well. Employment of seamen on American-flag vessels has fallen by 25,000 in the past 10 years. This decline in the U.S. fleet contributes to the American balance-of-payments problem and works to the detriment of the 100,000 workers in the maritime industry. What is of greater urgency at the moment, however, is the fact that the shipping and shipbuilding capacity of the United States has declined to the point where it adversely affects our national security. In a world which will very likely see an increasing need for the sea transportation of military goods to combat Communist aggression, we must maintain a merchant marine equal to the task.

A very perceptive article dealing with this disturbing situation appears in this week's America magazine. The author points out that American shipping requirements during the Korean war called for some 600 carrier vessels. Given the present state of American shipping, it is inconceivable that similar requirements could be filled by the U.S. fleet today. As a result, we find ourselves faced with the necessity of shipping vital military cargo on foreign-flag vessels. Such a situation is obviously undesirable from a national security point of view; yet, the present sad state of our maritime industry leaves us no alternative.

I submit, Mr. President, that these recent events are but another indication of the aimless drift which seems to characterize our present merchant marine policy, a policy which—unless it is changed—may cause serious disruptions to our military efforts in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from America to

which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEAK SPOTS IN OUR DEFENSES

(By Rear Adm. John D. Hayes)

(Since Korea, our country's share of world shipbuilding has dwindled to a mere 5 percent and 85 percent of our merchant ships are now over 20 years old. Perhaps, the author suggests, the struggle in Vietnam is going to bring us a nasty moment of truth.)

At the opening of the Korean hostilities, the U.S. merchant marine, although its ebb had already set in, was still the greatest the world had known. Its quiet, effective service made that war appear logistically easy and gave rise to the dangerous assumption that the United States would have little trouble conducting limited wars overseas. Today, it is difficult to see how the residue of that once great fleet can properly support our present commitment in Vietnam—soon to be 100,000 troops, the South Vietnamese forces and an enlarged 7th Fleet.

If military operations in Vietnam are allowed to expand even to the extent of the Korean war, we must be ready to accept severe and lasting strains in our economy and foreign relations. For we do not have now, as we had in the similar situation in 1950, the merchant shipping under our own flag to carry on a major overseas campaign.

A few figures are sufficient to describe the changed situation. In 1950, the United States had 3,400 relatively new merchant ships. Half of these were then in active service, carrying our domestic and 40 percent of our foreign trade, plus Marshall plan aid and much needed coal for Europe. Today, American flag merchantmen are carrying only 9 percent of the country's seaborne trade. In 1950, U.S. tankers were bringing in 53 percent of our petroleum imports; they haul only 5 percent today.

The anomaly is that the United States still has the world's largest merchant marine. Of the ships that compose it, however, 85 percent are now 20 years old; they are slow and unfit for military operations. The only section of U.S.-flag shipping in any state of health is the subsidized liner fleet composed of about 300 ships built since World War II. But if these ships are withdrawn from their present established routes for military purposes, maritime countries will eagerly move in to capture this last vestige of our foreign trade still under the U.S. flag.

It was the Marshall plan, beginning in 1948, that revived the ancient craft of shipbuilding in Europe, and the Korean war proved to be another Marshall plan, in this regard, for Japan. Shipbuilding in the United States, however, was not correspondingly stimulated. The Suez crisis, too, stimulated shipbuilding but little in the United States. As a result, the average age of the fleets of the maritime nations is around 10 years. Today, only 5 percent of world shipbuilding is being done in the United States.

While the American people and the U.S. naval profession allowed the U.S. merchant marine to decay, world seaborne trade has been increasing. Since 1951 it has doubled; indeed, the movement by sea of petroleum—the lifeblood of modern industrial economy and of modern war—has tripled. Much is heard these days about air movement of troops, and this form of military transport is bound to increase. But the giant jet aircraft that will do this work are insatiable consumers of fuel, which must be transported overseas to their terminals. Airlift, instead of easing the shipping problem, will augment it in the area where we are most vulnerable, the tanker fleet.

How much shipping will be needed for support of our Vietnam commitment? I

July 22, 1965

suspect that Pentagon planners do not know. In view of the successful support of the Korean war, the present demands appear easy to meet; but logistics for the affluent U.S. Armed Forces have a way of ballooning. The tonnage required for Korea in 1952 equaled that for the entire Pacific operations of the last year of World War II. It is not unrealistic to expect that the tonnage required for Vietnam will reach the Korean figure.

To support 500,000 men in Korea, half of them Americans, a daily supply of 20,000 tons of dry cargo and 125,000 barrels of petroleum products (full loads for 2 standard dry cargo ships and 1 tanker) had to be transported across 6,000 miles of ocean. For this, 350 ships were needed in the trans-Pacific supply line, as well as 250 more in the Western Pacific for troop movements and support from Japan.

Where are ships in such numbers to come from, today? Neither our mothball nor subsidized fleets can provide them. They must therefore come from the same source that is carrying our normal seaborne trade, namely foreign-flag ships of the traditional maritime nations and the American owned flag-of-convenience fleet.

To envision how grave this military predicament is, the lay reader may imagine the United States turning over responsibility for ground, naval or air defense to a foreign country without even protection of treaties or compacts. Because we have to depend on chartered foreign shipping to support our military operations, we have lost our freedom of action to control and use the seas in the cold war. Without such control, we have no seapower, despite a Navy that includes a nuclear carrier and Polaris missile submarines.

Columnist Raymond Moley (Newsweek, May 17, p. 112) calls attention to the fact that while our military policy in southeast Asia is now more in tune with geography and reality, we are nevertheless still not using the most effective tool against North Vietnam—a blockade. Any small-scale map will reveal that the only way for sizable shipments of arms to reach that country is by sea, and Moley mentions 201 ships entering the ports in 1964. In my opinion, the reason we are not blockading is simply the likelihood of protests from our friends, who must make their living from the sea and who oppose restrictions of any sort on seaborne traffic. The open reluctance of the British to join in an economic blockade of Cuba should be fresh in American minds.

There remains to us, then, the American-owned flag-of-convenience fleet (whose bulk cargo types could possibly fill our petroleum needs for Vietnam, though not our dry cargo needs). A Panamanian or Liberian flag flying from the stern of a giant modern tanker or ore carrier is a common sight in U.S. ports. Chances are one in four that such a ship, manned by a foreign crew, is American owned. Although she is a contribution to our economy that is not costing the American taxpayer one dollar, she is not legally a U.S. vessel.

In the case of a flag-of-convenience ship, a citizen of one state uses the nationality of another state for private purposes. The seas are free for all to use, but international law requires that a ship, like a person, have nationality. Some small states choose to use their rights to the sea to gain revenue by allowing shipowners of other countries to register under their flag. The shipowners thereby avoid their own country's restrictive maritime laws, high taxes and labor costs. Prime users of the flag of convenience are American oil, steel and aluminum companies. This legal expedient, however, is not popular with traditional maritime countries nor with U.S. seafaring unions.

The concern of Americans generally should be whether the availability of such ships under flags of convenience is certain in any

national emergency. Agreements for their return to the U.S. flag have been made with the owners, though only tacitly with the countries of present registry. By virtue of these agreements, the Navy Department and Maritime Administration claim they have effective control over these ships, but there are some Members of Congress who doubt this. The right of transfer of flag between belligerent and neutral has never been definitely settled in international law, and our relations are not good with one flag-of-convenience country, Panama. Our need for foreign shipping to support the Vietnam operation could give the European maritime countries a lever for checking this American practice.

Finally, the Soviet Union has both a large submarine force and a growing merchant marine, which in a decade may be among the world's largest. With its increased interest in maritime law, it may be expected to be heard from in the not too distant future on the touchy subject of the flag of convenience.

The threat to our commitment in Vietnam portends a far more ominous danger: a decline in U.S. seapower. Unless steps are soon taken to improve our alarming maritime position, the United States might well become a second-rate or third-rate power early in the 21st century. For a historical analogy, we need only remember Spain in the 17th century after her greatness in the previous one, and what has happened to Great Britain in little more than a generation.

The American economy now devours 50 percent of the world's raw materials. Until World War II, most of what the Nation required was found within our own borders, but 60 years of accelerating economic progress and two world wars have levied a severe drain on our forests and minerals. By 1980, the United States may be one of the world's poorest nations in high-grade ores. Our country, which too many Americans still think of as a rich heartland, is in fact fast becoming an industrial island, depending increasingly on imports from overseas and forced to compete with other areas demanding a larger share of the earth's resources.

Our seaborne trade is made up of two separate and unlike segments: importing of raw materials and exporting of processed goods. The import segment is by far the more important, for it is part of our basic industries and essential to our economic life. The bulk-carrier ships that bring these vital necessities to our shores are almost all under foreign flags. The largest and most automated ships being built in foreign yards are of this type, but a bulk-ore carrier has not been built in a U.S. shipyard in 20 years. Our laws require that a ship, to fly the American flag, must be built in the United States.

American sea communications are vulnerable in another area, or what is sometimes called noncontiguous shipping. The new State of Hawaii is overseas, and so is populous Puerto Rico. Alaska is virtually so. These outlying areas are just as much parts of the United States as Virginia and Iowa, but unlike the latter they must depend on overseas shipments for their necessities of life. The sealanes to them are exposed not only to the submarine but also to the perhaps more dangerous long-range, jet-powered, rocket-armed, land-based aircraft. Should the sealanes to the State of Hawaii be cut, those islands would be on short rations within a month.

Americans are not a sea-minded people, and these facts of life do not disturb them. When we think of our merchant marine at all, it is with a feeling of annoyance at its apparently insoluble troubles. Our national character has not been formed by the sea around us, and so we do not know what it offers, what it can deny, what must be forced from it. Even our statesmen give evidence

of not comprehending seapower and the Nation's need for it, and the U.S. naval profession has not tried very hard to make it understandable.

A shipping crisis over Vietnam would be a blessing in disguise; for only a near disaster will expose and dramatize the Achilles' heel of American greatness, and awaken the American people to the imminent peril that want of a fourth arm of defense poses to their national security and way of life. A sensational disclosure of our inability to conduct military operations in southeast Asia without the aid of foreign ships may goad Congress into action.

TRIBUTE TO G. MENNEN WILLIAMS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Gov. G. Mennen Williams of Michigan, was one of the best appointments made by President Kennedy, following his election in 1960. As Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Governor Williams has done a fine job of intelligently interpreting African interests. He has gained wide respect among responsible leaders in Africa, just as he has always enjoyed that respect in his own country. On July 20, a biographical sketch of Governor Williams appeared in the New York Times. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFORMAL DIPLOMAT: GERHARD MENNEN WILLIAMS

WASHINGTON, July 19.—Late in 1960, when Gerhard Mennen Williams was preparing to leave the Governor's office in Lansing, Mich., to take up his new duties as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, newspapermen in the capital composed a little farewell ditty that began:

"Far across the ocean blue,
Kasavubu waits for you,
Bye, bye, Soapy."

Today it became known through friends that after 4½ years of dealing with the problems of Congo President Joseph Kasavubu and other African leaders, Mr. Williams is thinking of turning back across the ocean blue to Lansing and a possible return to Michigan politics.

It was no surprise to anyone who knew the 56-year-old crewcut former Governor. His love for Michigan politics is as strong and enduring as his addiction to the polka-dotted green bow tie that is his personal trademark.

STALD ATMOSPHERE

Indeed, to many it had seemed that Mr. Williams carried the habits and customs of his political career into the normally more staid atmosphere of Foggy Bottom.

It was not just a matter of his wearing the polka-dot bow tie to even the most formal diplomatic affairs. It was also his serving as caller for a rollicking square dance for African diplomats in Washington—the same kind of square dance at which he would delight the Grange wives in Michigan.

On his frequent swings through Africa, he would shake hands, pose for photos, and exchange souvenirs with everyone from the prime minister to the women pumping water at the village well.

He crammed his office in the State Department's executive wing with so many treasures of his African tours that it began to resemble a corner of the Museum of African Art. It was all an expression of the enthusiasm and empathy that made Mr. Williams the unbeatable champion of Michigan poli-

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.
Mr. DOUGLAS. My colleague the junior Senator from Illinois is well advised to ask for a quorum call—we all wish to hear him speak—as a means of saving his strength for the great struggle which will shortly be upon him. We want him to be in full vigor for that.

Many of us feel as intensely on this subject as my colleague does. We do not desire to interrupt the business of the Senate, as my colleague has virtually served notice that he intends to do. But we shall fight it out, if it takes all summer, all fall, and all winter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am for that.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. As one of the newest Members of this body, and one who has tried to keep in close contact with his constituents in his home State of California, I assure both the junior Senator from Illinois and the senior Senator from Illinois that there is no question which is more important to be under consideration for the people of the State of California than the question now to be resolved. I bring notice again that a bipartisan committee has been working for sometime. That committee is made up of the leader of the minority party and the leader of the majority party. I should like to align myself with my leader on the minority side. I shall make arrangements to be here all summer, whether the eggs are smaller or larger, and whether the bread is fresh or stale.

I congratulate the Senator, and I align myself with him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am deeply grateful to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without losing my right to the floor; and I suggest to the Senate attaches that the quorum call will be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Illinois will retain the floor. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 199 Leg.]

Aiken	Fannin	McGovern
Allott	Fulbright	McIntyre
Anderson	Gore	McNamara
Bartlett	Gruening	Metcalf
Bass	Harris	Miller
Bayh	Hart	Mondale
Bennett	Hartke	Monroney
Bible	Hayden	Montoya
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Morse
Brewster	Hill	Morton
Burdick	Holland	Moss
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Mundt
Cannon	Inouye	Murphy
Carlson	Jackson	Muskie
Case	Javits	Nelson
Church	Jordan, N.C.	Neuberger
Clark	Jordan, Idaho	Pearson
Cooper	Kennedy, Mass.	Pell
Cotton	Kennedy, N.Y.	Prouty
Curtis	Kuchel	Proxmire
Dirksen	Lausche	Randolph
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Dominick	Long, La.	Robertson
Douglas	Magnuson	Russell, Ga.
Eastland	Mansfield	Saltonstall
Ellender	McClellan	Scott
Ervin	McGee	Simpson

Smathers	Talmadge	Williams, Del.
Smith	Thurmond	Yarborough
Sparkman	Tower	Young, N. Dak.
Stennis	Tydings	Young, Ohio
Symington	Williams, N.J.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Tydings in the chair). A quorum is present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] came to me and said he had a speech that probably would take an hour or more to deliver and that it was quite imperative that it be made today. I shall gladly yield to him with the understanding that I shall not forfeit my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I do not object. I ask my friend the Senator from Illinois or my friend the Senator from Pennsylvania if I may be permitted to ask a question of the Senator from Illinois concerning a matter to which he alluded in his earlier remarks.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I look forward with a great deal of interest to what I know will be a comprehensive presentation on the part of the Senator from Pennsylvania, who feels very strongly about the matter.

I have had a great deal of experience in seeing this matter unfold in the subcommittee and in the full committee.

I should like to get the thought of the Senator, if I can, concerning a matter which he mentioned. I believe that this is such a serious matter that we should debate it on the floor and make a determination up or down.

I should refer, as the Senator knows—and I have discussed this matter at some great length—that the measure go through the normal committee procedure. However, since that has been circumvented, I see no other alternative than to have a full and comprehensive discussion about it.

I am concerned about the reference made by the Senator from Illinois to section 14(b). He alluded to any issue that might be coming down the pike, so to speak. Would it not be best if I, as an insignificant junior Senator, were to suggest that, rather looking in the future at any and every bill as another battleground, we agree to do battle at this particular time and thus, not in dilatory manner, logjam the Senate once the decision has been made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would be perfectly agreeable to joining issue and doing battle.

I am perfectly agreeable also to accommodating myself to the imperative needs of the Senate. For example, I should certainly not want to stand in the way of a defense appropriation bill when we stop to consider what is going on 12,000 miles away from here in Vietnam.

I try to be circumspect about these things. However, I tried to make two things emphatic. The first is that I play

for keeps. The second is that I use whatever weapons are in the rule book.

I have had that rule book under my arm, and the House rule book also, for the past 32 years. A grizzled old Texan said to me the third day after I came to Congress, "Young man, if you expect to be useful around this place, you take that rule book home with you every night." Every night, I took the rule book home. That is the Bible. Of course, therein are the weapons, and therein we will find allusion to the precedents. I have to do battle in the best way that I can.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I want the record to show that I recognize that the Senator from Illinois is an extremely worthy adversary, I having been in the rather undesirable position of confronting him on opposite sides of one or two issues, as well as having been on the same side on others.

I want to make sure that the best interpretation of the battleground and of the rules would be the use of the rule book to the full extent in a battle. Once the issue has been joined and has been decided, we should then proceed to the consideration of other important matters which face the Senate and the country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I emphasize point No. 2. One battle does not make a war. I may lose the first battle. I approach it with a high degree of hope. However, if I lose the first battle, I must fight on and on until the victory is won. This is only the first battle. If, perchance, destiny will let the laurels of success perch upon my lamps and my shields, I shall be happy. If not, I must gird myself again and get the energy reservoir filled with what it takes to drive one on. I must look at the arsenal of weapons, take my choice, and continue the fight in the only way that I know, on the floor as these things come along.

I have all the precedents very carefully analyzed as to what I can or cannot do. Because of my fidelity to the State-Federal system that our forefathers gave to us, and because I believe that there is such a thing as sovereign power in the States and that there are some rights in the States, I propose in my feeble way to undertake to protect them as best I can.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as the Senator from Illinois knows, the junior Senator from Indiana is in agreement with the junior Senator from Illinois on most of the things to which he has alluded. I know that the Senator from Illinois does not have the reputation of being dilatory in doing battle. I look forward to a full discussion of this matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I trust so. And I trust that finally we can render a conclusion.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I say for the benefit of my colleagues that I shall occupy the floor for some time, possibly between 1 and 2 hours. I suspect that few, if any, of my colleagues

July 22, 1965

will share my own enthusiasm for the subject which I intend to discuss which is full employment and international finance.

I consider this to be extremely important subject. However, it is not the kind of subject which I expect would cause very many of my colleagues to remain in the Chamber and listen to it.

I hope that some of them will read the speech. It deals with an important matter. I make these comments with the thought that some of my colleagues might prefer to leave the Chamber.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Is a speech on international finance in conformity with the germaneness rule which the Senator has so stoutly advocated in the past?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it has always been my view that we play the game in the Senate according to the rules which are in effect at the time the whistle blows. The time for the germaneness rule to take effect expired at 2 o'clock today. So it is not necessary for me to seek permission.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, are we about to witness a filibuster by the non-filibusterers?

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a point of order.

The Senator from North Carolina has not propounded a proper parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, must I yield for a point of inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the floor. He does not have to yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I refuse to yield to my friend the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield for a parliamentary inquiry, if the Senator from New Jersey behaves himself in connection with propounding it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Senator would not insist that I return to my seat, would he?

Mr. CLARK. No.

Mr. CASE. I thank my colleague.

I ask if it is in order to raise the question of germaneness because I believe the Senator from Pennsylvania is incorrect in stating the period of germaneness has expired for this session. I understand it does not expire until 3:30 p.m. or thereabouts. It seems to me, if I may say so before yielding to the Chair to answer my question, that it is a little strange if it is impossible to interrupt a Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In response to the parliamentary inquiry raised by the Senator from New Jersey, under section 3 of rule VIII, the 3-hour germaneness period starts to run at the conclusion of the morning hour or after the unfinished business or pending business has first been laid before the Senate. Since the pending business of the Senate today was first laid before the Senate at approximately 11:05 a.m., the 3-hour period was over at 2:05 p.m. Therefore, the germaneness rule is not now in effect.

Mr. CASE. Is it in order to interrupt a Senator, regardless of his wishes, to raise the question of germaneness?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The second point is well taken. Although a Senator who has the floor does not have to yield for a point of order, the germaneness rule would be meaningless unless a Senator could interpose an objection that the speaking Senator was not observing the rule of germaneness and, therefore, under rule XIX a Senator may call the Senator who is addressing the Senate to order at anytime.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator from New Jersey is happy, I would like very much to proceed.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from New Jersey did not intend to make the point of order. He just wanted to know if he could.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as I said earlier, newspapers are full of references to high-level conferences which are taking place at the White House between the President and Secretary of Defense McNamara and other policy advisers.

The question has been raised in the press, in a number of articles which appeared this morning, as to what our war aims in South Vietnam are and what the rationale is on the basis of which we continue to fight in that country and, indeed, continue to build up American forces in that part of the world.

I ask unanimous consent that three articles, first, an editorial entitled "American Honor in Vietnam" which appeared in the New York Times this morning; the second, a column by Walter Lippmann entitled "The Larger War," which appeared in the Washington Post this morning; and the third, an article entitled "U.S. Professor Reports Flexibility in Hanoi Stand," under the byline of a well known international reporter, M. S. Handler, which appears on page 3 of the New York Times of this morning, may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 22, 1965]

AMERICAN HONOR IN VIETNAM

Speaking of Vietnam in a recent press conference President Johnson said: "Our national honor is at stake. Our word is at stake." It was not the first time that the administration has taken this position, but the emphasis and the timing of Mr. Johnson's remark gave it special importance.

The commitment involved in the President's statement is so portentous that it deserves careful examination. Obviously, if

the honor of the Nation is at stake to such a degree that American aims must be achieved, then the struggle is a war to the finish whatever the cost. If the United States were to lose its honor in Vietnam it would lose its preeminent place in world affairs, while the Communist bloc would win a victory of staggering proportions. This, clearly, would be unacceptable.

But the question does arise whether the honor of the United States is at stake in such a drastic and precise sense of the word. If the United States were to give up, pull out of Vietnam and leave the country to its fate there would, of course, be a loss of honor—but very few Americans would argue for such a solution today. Between doing that and forcing Hanoi to sue for peace on American terms there is a whole gamut of possible settlements that would not be at all dishonorable to any except those demanding a complete "victory" over the Vietcong and North Vietnam.

A statement like the one Mr. Johnson made arouses uneasiness because of its categorical nature. The stakes in the Vietnamese conflict are being raised steadily. The Vietnamese conflict—and no one needs to tell this to Washington—holds within it the possibility of a war with Communist China and a world war.

It is neither cynicism nor appeasement to point out that the word "honor" is not a scientific but an emotionally charged term of very high voltage. If President Johnson means that Americans would not accept a defeat so humiliating that it represents a loss of national honor, he is right. The risk comes in determining when, if or how honor would be lost. There are even such things as honorable defeats and dishonorable victories. And in between there are all kinds of compromises that are neither one thing nor another—but sensible and realistic.

In international politics it is wise to avoid extreme positions. American honor must by all means be preserved; it should, however, be given a reasonable connotation.

[From the Washington Post, July 22, 1965]

THE LARGER WAR

(By Walter Lippmann)

Secretary McNamara's return from Saigon has set the stage for a decision which has been anticipated for a long time. Ever since it has become evident that the air strikes would not bring the Indo-Chinese war to an end, it has been virtually certain that the American troop commitment would be greatly increased.

The air strikes were tried out as a relatively cheap and easy way of compensating for and covering up the defeat of the South Vietnamese army. In the past 6 months the plight of the Saigon army has become worse and worse, and today its reserves are used up, its troops are deserting in masses, the villages from which it could draw new recruits are in Vietcong hands, communications with the few centers that it still holds are substantially cut.

The decline of the South Vietnamese army has gone so far that President Johnson is confronted with the question of waging an American war. The crucial question which has to be decided is not how many more American soldiers shall be put ashore in Vietnam. Although this question is of enormous importance to the men themselves and to their families, although Congress and the country are vitally interested because it is certain to involve at least a partial mobilization, the crucial question nevertheless is what the president intends to ask this large American army to do. Will he give it a mission that can be accomplished? Or will he send it on a fool's errand, as all our previous missions in South Vietnam have proved to be—the conquering and occupation of the

July 22, 1965

villages and the countryside by American soldiers?

There is no indication as yet that the President has reached a decision on this fundamental strategic issue. The buildup of American forces does not decide the issue—which is whether the troops are going ashore in order to affirm the American presence during a negotiation for a political settlement, or whether they are the vanguard of a crusade to push communism back of the 17th Parallel, to teach China a lesson, to prove that Americans always win their wars. This is the issue that has to be decided, and in a self-respecting free society it would now be soberly and gravely debated.

The President has said enough to keep open his own power to choose. He has often said that he wants a limited war and a negotiated settlement. But again and again he has resorted to the hot slogans which, if taken at face value, would mean not a limited war but a total war. There is no assurance that the country will not be nudged and jostled—as it has been for a decade in Indochina—until it slithers and slides into a total war.

We are now in sight of a total war. We shall be much nearer the brink if we transform our intervention to help the Saigon government into an American war against the Vietcong and Hanoi. For with the crumbling of the Saigon army, with the defeat of the Saigon government in almost the whole territory of South Vietnam, with the corrosion and corruption of the government in Saigon itself, we are confronted with the proposal to replace the South Vietnamese with Americans, to replace our advisers, and to take command of the war, and—invariably as a result—to establish an American military government in Saigon to rule the native politicians and generals.

Can there be any serious question that such an expansion of American military power on the Asian mainland is likely to mean a war to the bitter end, not only against the Vietcong and Hanoi, but against China as well.

This is the point on which the country needs to be informed. It needs to be assured from the President himself that we are not enlarging our troop commitment in order to fight an Asian war with an American army and an American command and a military government. For on what terms would we fight such a war, and where could it end? It is too late in the day to worry about protocol, about consulting the United Nations or about consulting Congress and the people. But it is not too late, though it is the 11th hour, to ask and be told whether this is still to be a limited war.

[From the New York Times, July 22, 1965]

U.S. PROFESSOR REPORTS FLEXIBILITY IN HANOI STAND—JERSEY MAN TELLS OF TALKS WITH REDS IN ALGIERS, PARIS, AND SAIGON
(By M. S. Handler)

A New Jersey economics professor reported yesterday, after a visit to Saigon and other capitals, that the North Vietnamese had demanded U.S. agreement in principle on a withdrawal of forces from Vietnam, and not an actual withdrawal, as a precondition for negotiations.

The professor, Robert Brown, of Fairleigh Dickinson University, said this fundamental distinction had been emphasized to him in Algiers by a counselor of the Hanoi mission during a 2-hour discussion. He added that the official's version had been confirmed in Paris by unofficial representatives of the North Vietnamese Government before the professor proceeded to Saigon, where he arrived July 4.

Professor Brown made his trip as a member of a three-man mission sent to Saigon by the Inter-University Committee for Debate on

Foreign Policy, a group with headquarters in Ann Arbor, Mich.

The two other members of the mission, who met him in Saigon, were Prof. Jonathan Mirsky of the University of Pennsylvania, and Carl Oglesby, president of Students for a Democratic Society.

According to Professor Brown, the Hanoi representatives insisted that the "withdrawal" section of Hanoi's program for negotiations had been widely misinterpreted.

The three other sections of the four-point program call for a cessation of U.S. air attacks in North Vietnam, a return to the 1954 Geneva accords limiting military activity in Vietnam and providing for a national election, and a political settlement in the south according to popular wishes.

Professor Brown said that on the last night of a visit to Saigon by 12 leading American clergymen, representing the Fellowship for Reconciliation, they had heard the following peace proposals from an agent of the National Liberation Front, parent movement of the Vietcong:

An immediate cease-fire, with a freezing of current military position.

Adjudication by an international body in districts where control is in dispute.

U.S. preparation and execution of a troop withdrawal over a 6-month period.

A district-by-district election campaign from which a coalition government would emerge.

Professor Brown, who spent the period 1958 to 1961 in Vietnam as a U.S. aid official, speaks fluent Vietnamese. He said yesterday that the internal situation in South Vietnam had deteriorated so seriously that if the U.S. Government were to withdraw its armed forces suddenly the Saigon regime would vanish overnight.

Professor Brown said that he still believed the United States should withdraw but that the withdrawal should be planned carefully.

In several meetings with powerful Buddhist and Roman Catholic leaders, intellectuals, high Government officials, students and peasants, the professor said, he found a widespread feeling that Vietnam was being sacrificed to a struggle between the United States and Communist China.

This feeling was shared, Professor Brown said, even by those who were favorably disposed toward Americans.

The Buddhists and the others, he continued, feel that peace is the most important order of business if the country is to escape devastation. Saigon intellectuals, though protected from the hardships of the war, are passionately opposed to it, he said, and have no confidence in the Government, which they consider an American puppet. Although they are anti-Communist, the professor added, the intellectuals are apparently convinced that the Saigon leadership is hopeless and that the Communists are the only element in the country that have a strong national following.

Mr. CLARK. These three articles raise the following questions, which I would hope President Johnson would explore with the Congress and the American people after the executive conferences have concluded and he has made up his mind what to do with respect to the recommendations made to him by Secretary McNamara as a result of his recent visit in South Vietnam:

First. Is it really true that our national honor is at stake in South Vietnam; and if so, why?

Second. Is it true that the plight of the Saigon army has become worse and worse during the past 6 months; and if so, why?

Third. Is it true that the reserves of the Saigon army are used up and that there are few, if any, remaining reserves?

Fourth. Is it true that the Saigonese troops are deserting in masses, creating a very real problem not only of manpower but of discipline?

Fifth. Is it true that the villages from which the army commander of Saigon could draw recruits are largely in Vietcong hands, thus making it difficult, if not impossible, to draft more recruits into the Saigonese army?

Sixth. Are the communications of the few centers still held by the South Vietnamese and Americans cut, so that communications between them are interrupted as a practical matter?

Seventh. What mission does President Johnson intend giving to the larger American forces which the papers indicate are likely to be committed to South Vietnam? Is this mission to be the conquering and occupation of the entire country, including the villages and countryside, by American soldiers?

Eighth. Are we about to engage in an effort to push communism back to the 17th parallel in order to teach the Chinese a lesson, to prove that Americans always win their wars?

Ninth. What is the view of the administration as to whether the contemplated activities create a real risk that (a) the entire North Vietnamese army under the command of General Giap will be committed to ground warfare in South Vietnam; and (b) what is the appraisal by the administration of the chance that the commitment of substantial additional American forces will bring Communist China into the land war?

Tenth. And in many ways the most important. What is the appraisal of the Defense Department and of the Army as to how many American casualties we can anticipate during the remainder of this year if the plans approved by the President are carried into effect?

Eleventh. What is the best prognosis which can be given Congress and the American people as to how long the war will last, if the plans approved by the President are efficiently carried into effect.

With respect to the third insertion which I have just made in the RECORD, I invite the attention of the Senate to the statement made by Prof. Robert Brown, of Fairleigh Dickinson University at Rutherford, N.J., an individual who speaks fluent Vietnamese and who was a part of our AID mission in South Vietnam. Professor Brown has recently returned from a trip which took him to Algiers, to Paris, and to South Vietnam.

During the course of that trip, he had an opportunity to talk with unofficial representatives of the North Vietnamese Government. According to Professor Brown, the Hanoi representatives insisted that the withdrawal aspect of Hanoi's program for negotiation, which has been frequently reported in our press, has been widely misinterpreted.

Professor Brown stated that he was told that the condition for negotiations laid down by the North Vietnamese was

July 22, 1965

an agreement in principle that after a settlement—which in all likelihood would restore the Geneva Convention agreement of 1962—the Americans would, in due course, remove their Armed Forces.

This condition, however, has been represented to many of us as being quite different. We have been told that the North Vietnamese insisted on the immediate evacuation of American Armed Forces, a condition which I strongly oppose.

I do not believe that we can scuttle and run under such demand. I believe that we must stay in South Vietnam until an honorable peace can be negotiated. I strongly feel—and I hope that the President does also—that, in due course, we should provide for an appropriately neutralized Vietnamese Government, and that then American troops could well be withdrawn.

FULL EMPLOYMENT AND INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, my purpose is to develop the road we should take to solve the growing problem of adequate monetary liquidity to finance a constantly growing world trade.

My interest arises, in large part, from the connection between adequate international liquidity and full employment, with maximum production and reasonable price stability in the United States. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have become convinced that a flourishing and growing international trade is essential to the reduction of our presently unsatisfactory rate of unemployment in this country. This is primarily because our exports have always, in recent years, exceeded our imports. This excess means more jobs for Americans. We must keep it that way. With the growing spread of technology, automation and cybernation, and with the huge predictable increases in our labor force during the next decade, we require a flourishing international trade based on both exports and the employment created by imports to find jobs in this country for men and women who want them.

Moreover, an international financial crisis which might result in devaluation of the pound or even of the dollar would destroy that price stability on which our present prosperity depends.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield at that point?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my good friend the Senator from Indiana, to whom I am most grateful for taking the keen interest he has in the subject matter of my speech.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator will recall that a few years ago, in 1959 and 1960, we served on a committee concerned with unemployment problems in the United States.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I remember it well.

Mr. HARTKE. At that time, we visited some of the areas in Pennsylvania, and other States in the Nation, and

talked with persons who were suffering from unemployment. It is important for us not alone to consider what the domestic problem is at the moment, so far as jobs are concerned, but also to give increasing concern to problems which affect international trade, because it is an important element in keeping our people working at home.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I believe that this is one aspect of the employment problem which does not receive enough attention. Many of our markets are overseas, and our labor force is growing so rapidly, that unless we can acquire and keep new international markets, we shall never be able to keep everyone in a job back home.

Mr. HARTKE. I commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for taking this kind of leadership, which is unique in a way—that is, leadership in the field of considering employment and jobs which are so vital to the people at home and relating it to an international situation which sometimes is not easily understood at home. The clarity and emphasis with which the Senator from Pennsylvania is making his points, are such that I believe they should be well followed in this body, as well as in the rest of the Nation.

The difficulty is that by the time some of the effects, for example, of international liquidity are translated back home to the man who works in the factory, it is too late to do anything about the international situation. That is why I commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate and the country at this time, and to say that one out of every seven workers employed on the production line today depends directly or indirectly on what the Senator intends to talk about in the Senate today.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend the Senator from Indiana for his helpful intervention. I point out that with the inevitable increase in the labor force, as the war babies reach working age, we will need to increase the proportion of the total labor force devoted to foreign trade to avoid mass unemployment.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say to the Senator from Indiana that in a certain sense the luck of the draw has given me a unique opportunity in the Senate to acquaint myself with the subject, because I am not only chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but I also serve on the two subcommittees on Foreign Relations which have to do with international organization affairs, and economic and social policy affairs, so far as foreign relations are concerned, so that one would have to be very dumb, indeed, if serving in those areas the inter-relationship between employment at home and international trade were not brought home to him.

As a member of the Subcommittee on International Organization Affairs and Economic and Social Policy Affairs, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have become gravely concerned with the adequacy of the present international monetary system in meeting the fore-

seeable needs of international trade. In my judgment, the recent increase in the capital and lending power of the International Monetary Fund, necessary though it was, is hardly adequate to the task. Unless we can develop more sophisticated plans and procedures for providing monetary resources to finance international trade on a sound basis, I fear we may be headed for serious trouble—trouble which would inevitably have an impact on our domestic economy, on price stability, and on our full employment commitments to our people.

It is most encouraging to note that Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, understands the need for increased international liquidity. In a speech delivered at Hot Springs, Va., on July 10, Secretary Fowler called for a new international monetary conference to consider steps which might be jointly taken to secure substantial improvements in international monetary arrangements. He spoke of a series of bilateral and multilateral conferences which are currently taking place to develop a program around which a consensus can develop. He pointed out that three crucial facts make such a series of conferences highly desirable:

First. The U.S. balance of payments is approaching equilibrium.

Second. There is a rising tide of informed opinion that monetary arrangements can and should be substantially improved, building on the structure of the International Monetary Fund.

Third. Technical studies, notably the Bernstein and Ossola reports, necessary to give a thorough understanding of the problem and the various alternatives which might be followed have been completed.

I am delighted that Secretary Fowler is taking the initiative in this important international effort to solve a problem which threatens the prosperity of the free world. I regret that the French have, for the time being, said, "No," but their refusal to join us can be no more than temporary. The urgencies of the problem will, in due course, require them to join us in working out a solution.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator makes a very important point. The urgency of the problem will in due course of time require the other nations to join us. It is also necessary for us to point out that a few short months ago, before the reversal in our balance-of-payments situation, which is now in a surplus position of over \$1 billion on an annual basis, the French were more or less encouraging an international monetary conference. They have now done an about-face, because they may feel that the atmosphere is one which is more favorable to the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. I believe the Senator is correct. I also wish to point out what he and I were told not too long ago—namely, that there is good reason to believe that the French do not seem to know what they want to do, because General de Gaulle goes one way, the Finance Minister goes another way, and the director of the Central French Bank has

July 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17187

with racial matters enacted by the Mississippi Legislature during the years 1950-55 and 1956-59 while Mr. Coleman was, respectively, attorney general and Governor of that State. Not included in this compilation are statutes which, through routine appropriations and the like, acknowledge and maintain separate facilities for Negroes and whites. I am also listing some instances of opposition by Governor Coleman to bills proposed by the legislature.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,

Attorney General.

1. An act to provide State aid for construction of school facilities. It is hereby declared that it is the intent and purpose of this act to equalize school facilities between the races and to provide that the determination of expenditures shall take into account the quality of existing facilities for each race. (Dec. 28, 1953—Senate bill 1204).

2. An act authorizing the boards of trustees of school districts to assign public schools or attendance centers (Mar. 10, 1954—House bill 45).

3. An act to appropriate funds to provide instruction in graduate and professional schools for qualified Negro students who are residents of Mississippi in institutions outside of the State, when such instruction is not available for them in the regularly supported Mississippi institutions of higher learning (May 4, 1954—House bill 979).

4. An act to amend section 3, chapter 13, of the extraordinary session of 1953 to provide additional emergency grants of \$3 based on each Negro child in average daily attendance each year; and for other related purposes (Mar. 1, 1955—Senate bill 1202).

5. Acts to amend various election laws including implementation of section 244 of the Mississippi constitution dealing with literacy tests (Mar. 24, 1955—House bills 19, 24, 26, 95, 160, and Senate bill 1216).

6. In February 1956, Governor Coleman vetoed a bill designed to prevent FBI agents from making civil rights investigations in Mississippi. (He had originally proposed this bill.)

7. An act to require maintenance of separate accommodations, toilet facilities, and waiting rooms for the races traveling in intrastate travel at railroad companies, bus companies, and other common carriers of passengers (Feb. 21, 1956—House bills 7, 12, 22).

8. An act to confer upon any person, firm, or corporation engaged in any public business the right to choose and select its customers, to refuse service, and to provide penalties for any person who refuses to vacate a public place when ordered to do so by the owner or an employee thereof (Feb. 21, 1956—House bill 21).

9. An act to repeal the compulsory education law (Feb. 24, 1956—House bill 31).

10. In 1956, the Governor spoke against a legislative proposal to deny tax exemptions to churches whose property was used on a nonsegregated basis.

11. An act to establish the State Sovereignty Commission (Mar. 29, 1956—House bill 880).

12. An act to provide imprisonment terms for interracial marriages prohibited by law (Apr. 5, 1956—House bill 975).

13. An act to give effect to the resolution of interposition (Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 125) and to the principle of segregation of the races, to define violations thereof, and to provide penalties for the violation of these provisions (Apr. 5, 1956—Senate bill 1870).

14. In April 1958, Governor Coleman spoke out against a bill authorizing the hiring of white citizens councils by cities and counties for the purposes of distributing propaganda.

15. An act to authorize the attorney general of Mississippi to advise and assist

county, State, or school employees who are being sued or called as witnesses by the Commission on Civil Rights or other agencies of the United States for discharging their duties under the Mississippi constitution and laws (Apr. 25, 1958—House bills 936, 937).

16. In April 1958, Governor Coleman vetoed a bill to place responsibility for voter registration in the hands of court-appointed registrars, a bill which was characterized as aimed at maintaining white supremacy at the ballot box.

Senator ERVIN. Do you have any questions, Senator Kennedy?

Senator KENNEDY. Just one very brief question, Mr. Attorney General.

I appreciate the detailed testimony which you have given this morning. One of the problems which the Justice Department is confronted with in the variety of cases involving the recent Civil Rights Act is a case which has been brought in the district court in which there has not been expeditious treatment. One of the remedies would be for a writ of mandamus to be given by the circuit court judges. I think the record of the past has indicated that there are reservations by certain members of that court in granting writs of mandamus and that this is the whole question of time being as important as it is involved in these civil rights cases. Are you completely satisfied, with these other questions which have been raised, that Governor Coleman will act responsibly and with enlightenment in seeing that expeditious justice is done in these cases, and as a member of a panel?

Attorney General KATZENBACH. Yes, I am, Senator. I think you have accurately stated the fact that mandamus is an exceptional remedy. We have asked for it in the Department of Justice more times than we have gotten it. In fact I do not recall an instance where we have actually gotten any members of the court of appeals to issue a writ of mandamus so the issue is not certain members of that court having reservations. I think the issue would be that all members of that court, in fact all members of all circuit courts have reservations about mandamus, and about its procedure. I think that it is warranted in exceptional circumstances. I think the circumstances are exceptional that that court would give it.

One of our experiences has been often when we asked for mandamus, it becomes unnecessary for the court of appeals to decide that issue because the cause is expedited at the district court level.

Senator KENNEDY. You requested that on several different occasions, have you not?

Attorney General KATZENBACH. About five times, I think, in civil rights cases.

Senator KENNEDY. And you felt that there were adequate reasons to request a writ of mandamus.

Attorney General KATZENBACH. We felt that they were, but not all of the views that we express in any court are always accepted by that court even though I always think we are right.

Senator KENNEDY. And you would be satisfied that the nominee would act in such a way that he would not have reservations in issuing such a writ.

Attorney General KATZENBACH. I think he would have no different reservations any judge would have. I think it is an exceptional writ. I think in appropriate circumstances he would grant it.

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you.

Senator ERVIN. A writ of mandamus is a writ which is very rarely employed, is it not?

Attorney General KATZENBACH. Very rarely.

Senator ERVIN. And it is very rarely employed for the reason that it only lies to enforce the ministerial action and does not

lie in a case that involves discretionary action.

Attorney General KATZENBACH. That is correct, Senator. I think it would be accurate to say that courts of appeal do not like to tell the district judges how to exercise their discretion.

Senator ERVIN. Most civil rights cases—in fact, virtually all of them—involve equity proceedings, and equity proceedings, inherently, ordinarily involve the exercise of discretion, do they not?

Attorney General KATZENBACH. That is correct, but, Senator, I would not be honest with you if I did not think that in some courts there have been terribly unreasonable delays with respect to deciding cases.

Senator ERVIN. That has been true for a long, long time. I believe, even back in Shakespeare's time, Hamlet complained about outrageous fortune, did he not?

Attorney General KATZENBACH. I think there must be something in the Bible on it too, Senator.

Senator ERVIN. You were asked questions about statements made by Governor Coleman in his political campaign. Did you ever read the debates between Judge Douglas and Abe Lincoln when they were opposing candidates for the U.S. Senate in Illinois in 1858?

Attorney General KATZENBACH. A long time ago. I think you could have proved Abe Lincoln to be a segregationist.

Senator ERVIN. Absolutely, and Abraham Lincoln made a great many very intemperate remarks concerning the Supreme Court in its decisions, especially the decision in the Dred Scott case, in that campaign, did he not?

Attorney General KATZENBACH. Yes, he did, Senator.

Senator ERVIN. And some of Governor Coleman's statements pale into insignificance almost in comparison with some of Abraham Lincoln's statements, do they not?

Attorney General KATZENBACH. Yes, Senator.

Senator ERVIN. Now, with reference to the analogy of my good friend from New York about a juror in a capital case. A juror does not undergo the mental discipline that a lawyer or judge undergoes, does he, in the sense that in the very mental discipline which one gets in the practice of law and in the administration of justice as the judge does, that he acquires the capacity through his mental discipline to lay aside what he would like for the law to be and be guided by what the law has been declared to be by an authority of decision, does he not?

Attorney General KATZENBACH. Yes; I think so.

Senator ERVIN. And even in the case of a juror who says he does not believe in capital punishment, is it not frequently that the question is asked whether or not his beliefs about capital punishment would deprive him of the capacity to try the case according to the law and the evidence and to accept the law from the court, and if he answers that in the affirmative, he is chosen to serve?

Attorney General KATZENBACH. Yes.

Senator ERVIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Attorney General.

Attorney General KATZENBACH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the statement speaks for itself, but it shows that it was made by the Attorney General after the most thorough and intensive investigation and consideration of all the pertinent facts.

Many persons who do not know Governor Coleman personally testified and commented during the hearing. It has been my privilege to know him intimately for more than a quarter of a century.

17188

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 22, 1965

I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement that I made in introducing Governor Coleman at the hearings be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN C. STENNIS, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, it is a privilege to come here before this subcommittee. It is also a privilege to introduce and present to the committee the nominee.

I support this nomination—not because he is my friend—but because, being my friend, I have had the opportunity to learn and have learned that he is eminently qualified in every respect for this important office, and Mr. Chairman, I do speak of personal knowledge based on 30 years of continuous personal contact.

I am not only a supporter of his nomination; I was the first to recommend it to the President.

It is highly important that we make every effort to bring to the higher courts the finest and most qualified legal talent that is available.

The qualifications and skills which are necessary to make an outstanding jurist cannot be attained overnight. They are the results of years of painstaking study, hard work both in and out of the courtroom, and an unswerving dedication to the sound legal principles of our system and the majesty of the law. Governor Coleman has also superior qualities of character, honor, and integrity and these qualifications in full measure are essential.

He will bring to the court a wealth of legal knowledge as well as vital and practical experience in all fields and arenas of legal conflict. As a trial lawyer he sharpened his legal skills and talents in the courtroom—the laboratory and finishing school for practicing lawyers. I think that we could use more men in our judicial systems, Federal and State, who got the fundamentals of applied justice in the courtroom.

He hammered out the foundation of his professional career and future on the anvil of hard and grinding experience in the trial courtroom before judges and juries as well as in a heavy office practice.

Governor Coleman commenced his public career by being elected against difficult odds as district prosecuting attorney, then 25 years of age.

While he was district attorney and also engaged at the same time in private civil practice, he appeared in court many times in the circuit court where I was circuit judge. I saw him rapidly develop as one of the most effective and outstanding trial lawyers I have ever known. In fact, he is now one of the best in the South.

Later, I observed him while he served as a circuit judge. He is quick to grasp the fundamental legal questions involved in any given set of facts, and equally adept in supplying a sound and proper legal analysis and remedy. This natural and highly developed trait, plus his vast and varied experience in the legal profession and in governmental affairs, is a reason why I say he is an outstanding lawyer and will make an excellent judge.

After serving as district attorney, Governor Coleman was elected judge of the circuit court, a court of record and of unlimited jurisdiction. He went from the trial court to membership on the State supreme court, from whence he was soon called by the then Governor of the State to be attorney general. He was then elected to a full term to this office, where his services were outstanding.

Then, in 1955, I saw him win the Governor's race in an unusually strong field. He

filled that office with distinction during a most difficult 4-year term, January 1956 to January 1960.

Governor Coleman is far more than a mere practitioner of the law and a former officeholder. He is a devout believer in the law. It is part of his personal philosophy that the courts are the fundamental instruments of a free and democratic people, and that law and order is the indispensable guarantee of a civilized society. He will take that philosophy with him if confirmed for the high office to which he has been nominated. He has all the attributes of intelligence, ability, and experience which are the marks of an outstanding jurist.

Furthermore, he is a man of personal courage. Moreover, he has to a high degree that natural quality of fairness and impartiality which is essential in the making of a splendid judicial officer.

I believe he should be and that he will be confirmed by this subcommittee, the full committee, and by the U.S. Senate, and that his career on the bench will be outstanding and of the highest order.

Gentlemen, as I say, it is a privilege to commend as well as present to you Governor Coleman.

NATIONAL AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL WEEK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, through the indulgence and graciousness of our distinguished majority leader, to put my request in proper perspective, I am permitted to move to call up Calendar No. 436, Senate Joint Resolution 66, and ask that it be stated, for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6 in 1965 as "National American Legion Baseball Week."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair first wishes to make an inquiry. Did the Senator from Illinois ask unanimous consent or move that the joint resolution be considered?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have moved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, first, I wish to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the motion subject to unanimous consent, or can it be brought—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Illinois has moved for the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is that in proper parliamentary order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order. The motion is debatable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Illinois had first asked for recognition for a discussion of the motion. If the senior Senator from Illinois wishes to discuss the motion, the chair will recognize the junior Senator from Illinois at this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to my colleague from Illinois without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The junior Senator from Illinois should have the first inning. He should go to bat first.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But if my colleague has some comment to make—

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; my junior colleague should have the right to speak first.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. I had in mind to speak for about 2 or 3 minutes on the subject of Vietnam. I did not wish in any way to encumber my speech in chief on the Coleman nomination.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New York for that purpose, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his always unfailing courtesy.

Fe. On Davis
THE CRISIS IN VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, like so many of the rest of us, I am deeply troubled about the report of Secretary of Defense McNamara and deeply troubled by the indication, which we find on all sides, not only of the escalation of the struggle in Vietnam—let us assume that we have crossed that bridge—but on the vesting in the United States of, perhaps the primary, indeed, perhaps the sole, responsibility for carrying on the military struggle against the Vietcong and against the North Vietnamese in South Vietnam.

On many occasions I have laid before the Senate the proposition that the President does not, from the point of view of crystallizing the sentiment of the country upon this subject, have the kind of mandate for this type of action which, considering the character of the action, he ought to have. The August 1964 joint resolution, which gave the President the authority, if he needed any—he could have acted in any case as Commander in Chief—to use the Armed Forces of the United States in the struggle, is long since out of date by reason of events and by the interpretation of the authority that the President has put upon that particular mandate.

Everybody knows—I am not telling any secrets—that we are on the threshold not merely of escalation, but of really changing the basic character of the struggle in such a way as greatly to involve the United States.

I do not believe that Gallup polls are equivalent to considered debate by the people and the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States. I respectfully submit that it is a great mistake for the President not to come back to Congress for a new mandate and to let the people, through Congress, determine, with the President, what should be the limits, if any, to be placed upon this large scale and portentous involvement in the struggle in Vietnam.

July 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17189

On June 24, 1965, I introduced with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] a joint resolution, S.J. Res. 93, that would fully raise this question. Senator RANDOLPH and I wrote to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee urging early hearings on the resolution. However, we received a reply which, I assume, reflects the policy of this administration, informing us that the committee refused to take any action on the resolution.

Since I believe the issue is so timely and the committee's decision is so portentous and so wrong, I shall read that exchange of correspondence into the RECORD.

JULY 7, 1965.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On June 24, we introduced Senate Joint Resolution 93, a resolution designed to supplement Public Law 88-480, the joint resolution of August 10, 1964, to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia.

We believe—and we know other Senators concur—that hearings, both open and executive, on Senate Joint Resolution 93 would have a significant and salutary effect on the conduct of our policy in southeast Asia.

We are aware of the reported preference of the administration to rely on the August 10, 1964, resolution and on other indications of congressional approval and support for our current policy. Nevertheless, we are convinced, for the reasons set forth on the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 93 and asserted on other recent occasions by Members of Congress, that constructive discussion and reasoned debate, carrying the duty of positive congressional action on specific legislative language, would make a valuable—indeed, a necessary—contribution to putting the people and the Congress behind a specified course in Vietnam.

We know the extent of congressional power and responsibility in the field of foreign policy, and the extent to which the exercise of that power seems in recent times to have become in many ways more restrained and the fulfillment of that responsibility less complete.

In these troubled and dangerous days, we are not discharging our duty to ourselves, to our constituents, or to our country, unless we make every effort to guide our own destiny as a nation. In the current situation in southeast Asia, decisions on decisive actions may be taken at any time, and once taken can commit our Nation and our people. We therefore urge your favorable consideration of this request for hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 93 at the earliest practicable time.

Sincerely,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
JACOB K. JAVITS.

JULY 13, 1965.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATORS: At a committee meeting on July 12, your letter of July 7 advocating open and executive hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 93 was discussed.

The committee has reviewed the situation in Vietnam in executive session 11 times since January 1965. On several occasions, interested Senators not members of the committee have participated in these meetings, including on two occasions all members of the Committee on Armed Services who were available. The committee expects to keep

itself constantly and currently informed on developments in Vietnam.

The nomination of Mr. Lodge to be U.S. Ambassador to Vietnam will shortly be considered by the committee at which time there will be additional opportunity to review the situation in Vietnam.

Under these circumstances, it was the consensus of members that it was not advisable at this time to schedule either open or executive hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 93.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

Mr. President, with the greatest respect and the greatest esteem for the committee chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and his colleagues, I submit that we have done all that we can. The door is closed on any expression of congressional opinion arrived at in the way that our Constitution, in my judgment, expects us to debate, to hear debate on, and to consider this very grave responsibility.

The President, as I view it now, proposes to carry on alone and not to ask Congress, and, through Congress, the people to proceed with him.

When it appears that the entire matter will be placed on a different plateau, involving the greatest portentousness and the greatest danger, and affecting very profoundly the future of the United States, I would not be true to myself as a Senator if I did not protest against this action. I believe it is unwise.

While I naturally and loyally support our President's actions, I must, at one and the same time, protest what I consider to be a very unwise course of procedure in not again submitting this matter to Congress.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

NATIONAL AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL WEEK

The Senate resumed consideration of Mr. DIRKSEN's motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6 in 1965 as "National American Legion Baseball Week."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 66.

Mr. DIRKSEN. On my motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has not yet been made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The motion to proceed to its consideration is now pending.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, until it is made the pending business, obviously no substitute or amendments could be offered. It may well be that some Senator will wish to make a comment on the matter. Therefore, momentarily, at

least, I shall be glad to yield the floor until this measure is made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I determine if my understanding is correct? If it is incorrect, I hope that my junior colleague will correct me. I understand that when Senate Joint Resolution 66 is once made the pending business, my junior colleague will proceed to move to substitute his constitutional amendment, the precise nature of which we do not at present know, but, which, in its previous forms, has provided for a constitutional amendment to be submitted to the States to permit one house of the various State legislatures to be apportioned on a basis other than population, and, therefore, to reverse the decision of the Supreme Court in the Alabama case.

With all courtesy, I ask my friend and colleague—and I hope he is my friend as well as my colleague—

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask my colleague whether I have understood his intention correctly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, my senior colleague has correctly understood me, with one exception. This would not be a reversal of the decision of the Supreme Court. However, in all other respects, the Senator is correct. I propose to offer this joint resolution looking toward a constitutional amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his frankness. I have always enjoyed most friendly relations with my colleague. We have not always agreed, although, in the past year or so, we have agreed a larger percentage of the time. I have always had the most kindly feelings toward my colleague.

Those of us who are opposed to the constitutional amendment have decided not to oppose the motion to proceed to the consideration of the National American Legion Baseball Week joint resolution. We are as much in favor of the proposal as is my junior colleague—perhaps a little more so. We really want the National American Legion Baseball Week measure passed.

We want to encourage junior league baseball. We hope that the joint resolution can pass unencumbered by so grave and portentous an amendment as may be offered. We are for baseball on its own merits. We would regret having a blow struck at baseball by moving to lay aside the American Legion baseball measure and having a constitutional amendment substituted for it.

As I say, we shall not oppose the motion to take up this measure. We will, however, oppose a motion to substitute his constitutional amendment for the baseball week. We are in favor of baseball, pure and undefiled. We shall be prepared, not to filibuster, but to discuss the measure in the proper depth. No more important issue is before the country than this measure.

We regret that this will be introduced at a time when a good deal of pending legislation is before us, when the inevitable insertion of such a proposed constitutional amendment as this would delay the consideration of other measures.

We believe that this is a disruptive move so far as the calendar of the Senate is concerned. While my colleagues on the Committee on the Judiciary will speak at greater length and with more information upon the fact that this is a blow to the Committee on the Judiciary itself, I hope that I may, in a preliminary fashion, be permitted to sound that note.

My able colleague sought to get his constitutional amendment through the Committee on the Judiciary. I thought that he was going to accomplish that purpose. Very frankly, had it not been for some alert members of the Committee on the Judiciary, he would have succeeded. However, we had some very capable members of the Committee on the Judiciary, and gradually the force of their argument was such that my able colleague was unable to secure, at least in his judgment, a majority. The newspaper reports say that there would have been a vote of 8 to 8 and the motion would have failed of a majority and would die in committee. Therefore, my able colleague proposes—if I may mix metaphors from baseball and football—to make an end run around the Committee on the Judiciary and to bring this measure directly to the floor.

I have participated in somewhat similar moves in the past on other measures. I do not reprimand my colleague for doing so. However, I believe that there are other Senators who, on matters involving civil rights, are jealous of the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, and who have opposed presenting matters to the Senate which have been adversely passed upon by the Committee on the Judiciary.

I touch that note to remind them of their past positions before they propose to support this measure.

I have referred to this as an end run around the Judiciary Committee. Perhaps, if I may go back to baseball analogy, with all deference to my colleague, I would say this is a foul ball. It is a proposal to consider the gravest constitutional issue without adequate consideration by the Judiciary Committee. This is probably the most important question that will arise and it needs to be thrashed out in committee.

I remind my colleagues that it requires only the control of one house of a State legislature in order to exercise the veto power upon legislation which is before that State legislature. We have just had an experience of this nature in our own State of Illinois, where my colleague's party controls the senate and my party controls the house because of a huge popular majority. The Illinois House passed a great deal of legislation which I think the judgment of history will record as being in the public interest, only to have the measures defeated in the senate and the program of the Governor disrupted.

There was a somewhat similar situation, according to the newspapers, in the State of Colorado.

History is replete with instances where one house can negate the decisions of the people and then force either a compromise or complete defeat of needed and approved legislation.

This is a grave matter before us, one that we should discuss in depth—and not filibuster. We will not oppose the motion to take up Senate Joint Resolution 66, but we will oppose the forthcoming motion to substitute an amendment.

Mr. President, if I have the floor, I shall be glad to yield to the very able Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], who has been chairman of the subcommittee considering the amendment, for such comments as he may care to make.

Mr. BAYH. I thank the Senator from Illinois. He has made a significant contribution—and he certainly has had much more experience in this body than has the Senator from Indiana—in pointing out the intricacies of the astute parliamentary move of our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

However, I should like to propound a question to the Chair to make the Record clear as to what the specific issue is on which we are about to make a determination.

Am I correct in my judgment that the question the Senate is being asked to consider is whether or not to consider Senate Joint Resolution 66, which provides for the designation of "National American Legion Baseball Week" during the period August 31 through September 6?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion pending before the Senate at this time is the motion by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 66.

Mr. BAYH. I believe I am correct in my judgment that this joint resolution would in effect establish the period to which I have referred, August 31 to September 6, as "National American Legion Baseball Week."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6, 1965, as "National American Legion Baseball Week."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Am I privileged to make a point of order that there is no quorum present without losing my right to the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator would have to obtain unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall ask for that directly, but while my distinguished senior colleague is present—and he has alluded, of course, to a mixed metaphor with respect to baseball and football—I can only say that when he speaks of an end run, I say, in the most complimentary fashion, that he no longer is

playing in the ranks of the amateurs; he is a great professional.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank my colleague for placing me among the professionals. I have had a long struggle in trying to acquire a professional status for 17 years. I am glad I have been added to the ranks of the professionals.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If this were in Old Blighty, I would tap the Senator on both shoulders and say, "I dub thee professional."

Mr. President, there need be no solicitude about the American Legion Baseball League. Long ago I was a district commander in the American Legion. Long ago I was a county commander in the American Legion. I will yield to nobody in my devotion to that great organization. But I call my colleague's attention to the fact that they are not asking for this designation until the week of August 31 to September 6. It so happens that the joint resolution is a matter for a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee that has only two members. Incidentally, it is the only subcommittee of the Senate of which I am aware of which a Republican is chairman; and I happen to be that Republican.

Whenever I want to have a meeting of that subcommittee, I can have it in a telephone booth, either in the Democratic cloakroom or in my own cloakroom, because I would call the other member of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and say to him, "The subcommittee is in session," and then we would consider the resolution.

I may say it is one of the most expeditious committees in this body.

I told the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who was the author of this proposal, that I would see to it that in good time we would take care of the American Legion Baseball Week, because I, too, am vitally interested in the matter.

So have no concern, weep no tears, express no solicitude, because that, too, will be taken care of in good time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I congratulate the distinguished Senator on making this move. Second, I remind him that the situation now is somewhat similar to the one when we took up the Senate joint resolution establishing a national monument to the memory of Alexander Hamilton, who, I believe, means much to the party on the other side of the aisle, as well as to all Americans.

The purpose there was to attach what is now the 24th amendment to the Constitution to that joint resolution, and to move ahead to the submission of that amendment to the States, which has since been ratified and has become a part of the U.S. Constitution.

I recall that the same question arose then: Are we hindering something quite popular, designed to revere the memory of Alexander Hamilton? Indeed, with not as much assurance behind it as has been put behind this one by the Senator

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the executive calendar, beginning with that of James F. Gordon, of Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Harold H. Greene, of Maryland, to be associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Gerald D. O'Brien, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Commissioner of Patents; and Richard A. Wahl, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Commissioner of Patents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the executive calendar will be stated, beginning with that of James F. Gordon.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James F. Gordon, of Kentucky, to be a U.S. district judge for the Western District of Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Donald H. Fraser, of Georgia, to be a U.S. attorney for the Southern District of Georgia for the term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Thomas B. Mason, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the Western District of Virginia for the term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James P. Coleman, of Mississippi, to be a U.S. circuit judge for the 5th Circuit.

Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. MAGNUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, upon this nomination I wish to be heard. I shall seek a yea-and-nay vote on it. There are enough Senators in the Chamber, at the moment, and I therefore ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for one moment, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Washington, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LABELING OF CIGARETTE PACKAGES—TRANSLATION OF FRENCH AND GERMAN STUDIES

As in legislative session,

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on June 16, I asked and received unanimous consent to have the Library of Congress translate studies written by some French and German scientists and filed with the Committee on Commerce during the hearings on S. 547 and S. 550, bills to regulate labeling of cigarettes.

These translations have now been made, and I ask unanimous consent to file them with the Committee on Commerce as a part of the original records.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Ohio, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXCISE TAXES ARE ALREADY BEING KEPT BY VENDORS

As in legislative session,

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Congress recently enacted a bill to eliminate excise taxes on many commodities in this country. At that time, discussions were had to the effect that there would be a failure to pass on to the consumer the suspension of the tax and the gains attained from its elimination.

I am shocked to have received from an Ohio constituent clear verification of the apprehension of many of us that instead of savings being made to the consumer through elimination of the excise tax, by having it transferred on to the consumer, it is being picked up by the vendor.

I have a letter from a citizen in Dayton, Ohio. With the letter he enclosed a notice which he received from his bank.

The notice reads:

DEAR CUSTOMER: You will find that your bill for safety deposit rent is the same as last year.

Although the Government has removed the excise tax on your box, we have increased the cost of your box by an amount equal to the tax. Thus you will pay no more or less than last year.

We have taken this step because of increased personnel and operating costs and with the hope that it will inconvenience you less than an across-the-board increase.

Cordially yours,

FRANK S. ANGER,

President, Winters National Bank & Trust Co.

DAYTON, OHIO, July 1, 1965.

Mr. President, I believe that what has been done in this case is indefensible. I cannot understand how a banking institution can have the audacity to take a step of this kind, when it was clearly indicated that the purpose of removing the excise tax was to help the consuming public and the purchaser of services of this kind.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President—

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have called for the majority leader to return to the Chamber. I wish to discuss a procedural matter in his presence, but inasmuch as he is not present at this moment I hope that the Senator from New York will proceed and permit me to interrupt him later as soon as the majority leader comes into the Chamber.

Mr. JAVITS. Whenever the Senator is ready, I shall be glad to yield to him.

NOMINATION OF JAMES P. COLEMAN TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in raising the questions relative to the nomination of former Gov. James P. Coleman, of Mississippi, to be a judge of the Circuit Court for the Fifth Circuit, I wish it to be understood, first and foremost, that I do not take this responsibility lightly, nor is it at any time pleasant to have to oppose the nomination of a man who has served most of his life in useful public service; nor, from the vote in the committee, would it appear that I have, so far at least, been joined by many members of similar mind.

However, I believe that we face a portentous question. It is one of the most profound duties of a Senator to fulfill with conscience the requirement for advice and consent, and to use his honest judgment and discretion in giving such advice and consent. I feel it my duty to lay this question before the Senate—I hope with objectivity and due regard to the dignity of the office.

It has been recommended by the Judiciary Committee on a divided vote, that the nomination of Governor Coleman be confirmed. I shall relate the facts and circumstances bearing upon my opposition so that the Senate may, with deliberation, act upon them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at that point?

July 22, 1965

Mr. JAVITS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the majority leader, so that I may raise a few parliamentary questions. I should like to be advised when the hearings before the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee on the nomination of former Governor Coleman were first available to Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair believes that the chairman of the committee is best qualified to answer that question.

Mr. MORSE. I have been advised that they were first available this morning. I had not seen them until 10 minutes ago. They were not on my desk. I had to send members of the Senate staff to obtain a copy of the hearings for me.

I wish to read the hearings. I say to the majority leader that, subject to discussion, my tentative thought is that we should seek to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to fix a time certain to vote on the nomination. I have no desire, I assure the majority leader, to hold up consideration of the nomination for any length of time.

On the other hand, I take very seriously my responsibility to advise on nominations, and I want to know what I am advising on when I vote. I wish to find a basis, if I can find it, for voting for the nomination. I am influenced by the fact that liberals on the Judiciary Committee, I understand, have voted for confirmation. They would not have done so if they had felt that there was not sufficient or adequate basis for their vote.

I do not like the idea of having the nomination called up for consideration in the Senate when we all know it is a controversial nomination, when a copy of the hearings was handed to me only in the past 10 minutes, and when I have had no opportunity to read the transcript of the hearings.

I do not think this is an appropriate procedure for us to follow.

To show my good faith, I am perfectly willing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the nomination tomorrow at a time certain. However, I would not be inclined to vote on it until I have finished reading the hearings, even if it required me to read them aloud for my own edification, at least, in order to know what we are considering, before I vote, and so that I may know what is contained in the hearings.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have the floor. I wonder if the Senator will allow me to interrupt him at this point.

Mr. MORSE. I am at the mercy of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. No; not at all. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator. I should like to interrupt him when the Senator is ready to have me do so.

Mr. MORSE. Of course.

Mr. JAVITS. I handled most of the questioning before the subcommittee. Other Senators asked questions also. Perhaps I took the most time. I am not a member of the subcommittee, but a member of the full committee. I was treated with the greatest courtesy and

respect, and given all the time I wished to take. There is no problem on that score. I have had full opportunity to examine the hearings in great detail. I had assumed, because I know nothing to the contrary, that perhaps there would be at the most three reasonably long speeches, including my own in respect of this matter, and that then there would be a vote on the nomination.

My plans will take me away from Washington tomorrow, and similarly on Monday they will keep me away from Washington until about 2 o'clock.

The record of the hearings is not very long, as the Senator will see. Perhaps I can highlight for the Senator the principal points, and the Senator might consider, while I am speaking, perusing the hearings; and after he has had an opportunity to browse through them perhaps we can vote on the nomination at 6 or 6:30 this evening.

Or, if the majority is willing, the vote could be had on Monday at approximately 2 o'clock in the afternoon. In that way I could meet a commitment which I made in all good faith. I have consulted with the majority leader and the minority leader and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and it was understood that consideration of the nomination could be concluded in a few hours.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would not be inclined to enter into any such unanimous-consent agreement. I shall read the record.

There are two principles involved. The first is that whenever the Senate is confronted with a nomination that involves the advice and consent of the Senate on a controversial matter, it should not be brought up on one day and voted on that day, when Members of the Senate may be in doubt and have not had adequate time to study the record.

I have not been wasting any time in my job in the Senate. I have been working for long hours each day.

I again say that my understanding is that the transcript of the hearings was not available until a short time ago.

In any event, if the hearings were available, they were certainly not available to the Senator from Oregon until a few moments ago. The responsibility is not mine to go out searching for the hearings. The responsibility is on the committee to put a copy of the hearings on my desk. The hearings were not on my desk at the time the nomination was called up. I intend to carry out my duty, and I want to know what I am voting on. That means that I intend to read the hearings.

I do not browse through material like this. I read it. I wish to be absolutely certain that my vote on this nomination is substantiated both by the hearings and by the debate that will take place on the floor of the Senate.

All I am asking for is a reasonable period of time to study the hearings, and for fixing a time certain to vote on the nomination. It is all right if the time is fixed for Monday or for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I say to my friends from Mississippi that I do not believe any

wrong would be done to anyone. No great wrong would be done to Mr. Coleman, I say to the Senators from Mississippi, if the vote were postponed until a time certain, either on Monday or tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has made a reasonable request. In line with his suggestion, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the Coleman nomination occur at 4 o'clock on Monday afternoon next.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object, because I have agreed on this—I ask the majority leader whether it would fit in with his plans, and if he would be gracious enough, to allow me to make my address in chief today. I am ready to do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to ask if the majority leader would be gracious enough to let me have perhaps 20 minutes on Monday before the vote; and that he use his best efforts in my behalf in that connection. I should like to summarize my argument at that time. I shall make my major argument today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall put forth my best efforts in the Senator's behalf.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sure the Senator will do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That the Senate proceed to vote on the nomination of James P. Coleman, of Mississippi, to be U.S. circuit judge for the fifth circuit, at 4 p.m., on Monday, July 26, 1965.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the other nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to restate the unanimous-consent agreement. It is agreed that the vote on the Coleman nomination will occur at 4 o'clock on Monday afternoon; and that the yeas and nays which have been ordered will be applicable then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

John F. Kennedy
VIETNAMESE REFUGEES

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the cruel logic of any military conflict carries in its wake a tremendous toll in human suffering. Nothing illus-

trates this more in South Vietnam than the mounting flood of refugees.

Some 300,000 to 400,000 men, women, and children are crowded into five reception centers along the South Vietnamese coast. Several hundred thousand additional South Vietnamese citizens are uprooted in the interior. Indeed, it has been estimated that the number of war orphans in South Vietnam is in the tens of thousands.

My purpose today is to bring before this body some of the information and facts concerning the South Vietnamese refugee problem, and to stress our need to anticipate at this time an almost certain escalation of the numbers and the needs of these refugees in the immediate future.

The Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees has been holding hearings during the past 10 days on Vietnam. During the course of these hearings, and from direct press reports from Vietnam, it is becoming increasingly clear that the mounting flood of refugees reflects a recent important change in emphasis in Vietcong tactics in the countryside.

While terror has never been absent, earlier Vietcong tactics stressed the careful wooing of villagers and the winning of their allegiance. This, apparently, has in large part recently given way to all-out tactics of calculated oppression, brutality, and terrorism.

Former Ambassador Leonard Unger, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs of the Department of State, in testimony last week before the subcommittee, described the terrorism and even actual attacks on otherwise peaceful Vietnamese villages. Ambassador Unger told the subcommittee that more than 2,000 local officials and civilians in South Vietnam have been murdered in recent months as part of this calculated buildup of terrorism.

Philip Geyelin, in the July 15, 1965, Wall Street Journal, reported that—

In the Vietcong haste to make the most of the monsoons, their tactics have become tougher . . . efforts to ingratiate have given way to rough stuff—terrorism, assassinations and pillage—in order to collar recruits and gather supplies from the local populace.

Last Tuesday, Jack Langguth, of the New York Times, in a dispatch from Saigon, told the following story:

Fifteen miles south of Pleiku, refugees arriving in a special forces camp told about Vietcong terrorism in the village of Pleibrenng.

They said that the Vietcong entered the town Saturday night and instructed the villagers to sing songs of the National Liberation Front, the political organization of the Vietcong. When the people, most of them mountaineers, refused, the Vietcong threw a grenade at them, killing 12 persons and wounding 26.

On Monday, John T. Wheeler, of the Associated Press, described the results of the strategic bombing of the South Vietnamese village of Bagia. The cruel dilemma of strategic necessity versus injury and uprooting of innocent villagers is cogently posed and I commend the article to the attention of this body.

Rutherford M. Poats, Assistant Administrator of AID for the Far East, summed up for the subcommittee last week the

cause of the increased refugee flow as a flight from danger, "the danger of war, the danger of Communist terrorism, the danger of our counteraction against this Communist terror."

Whatever the cause of the flight, the effect of the refugee flow is the fostering of instability and confusion in the countryside, the overtaxing of relief facilities, and the clogging of roads which greatly hamper the movement of Government personnel and materials.

As Ambassador Unger pointed out in his testimony, caring for the refugees, providing them with food and other necessities, and protecting the asylum areas from guerrilla attacks and infiltration, is difficult and expensive—particularly in view of the increasingly successful interdiction of South Vietnam's supply routes and relief convoys by Vietcong forces.

Ambassador Unger was careful to emphasize that our economic aid programs—including aid to refugees—are just as important as our military aid to Vietnam.

Mr. President, added to the increasing military pressures, the political and economic strain of the refugee problem harbors seed of great crisis, which could substantially contribute to Vietcong efforts to undermine and destroy the morale and resistance of the Vietnamese people and the government in Saigon.

In his Wall Street Journal report, Mr. Geyelin quotes Mr. Richard Evans of the U.S. aid mission as saying that if the present trend in South Vietnam continues:

Everybody becomes a refugee.

Mr. Geyelin continues:

And in that case, the real calamity to fear—the real payoff for the Vietcong's economic disruption campaign—would be a trek to the National Capital for help. "You could have 5 or 10 million marching to Saigon," Mr. Evans warns.

A serious related problem to the flight of the refugees is the trojan horse strategy used by the Vietcong. There is ample evidence to indicate that the refugee flow is providing Communist forces with a convenient vehicle to infiltrate government controlled areas with Vietcong cadres.

Richard Critchfield in the July 18, 1965, Washington Star, reported that Brig. Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi, the military governor of central Vietnam recently issued an order forbidding the influx of any more refugees into the coastal towns and cities.

Critchfield explains that—

This fear was that the 300,000 refugees who had already fled to the coastal area, provided the Vietcong with a vehicle to infiltrate Government controlled areas with Communist agents.

This problem, however, is not insurmountable and should not deter full scale assistance to refugees, regardless of their number and attending problems. This must be an integral part of the United States commitment to South Vietnam, for humanitarian reasons in the first instance, but also to further this Nation's two-pronged effort to create conditions of security from direct and indirect ag-

gression, and to improve conditions of stability among the Vietnamese people.

We must consider every possible alternative in efforts to assist and protect the refugees. We must take into account the real possibility of a doubling, even tripling of the number of refugees.

In this connection, testimony before the committee by both Government and private agency witnesses shows that the aid and assistance program to refugees in Vietnam until recent weeks was diffuse and operating on an ad hoc basis.

We are encouraged by the recent formation of a formal coordinating council in Vietnam, composed of Vietnam and United States Government and private agency personnel.

We hope some of the aid problems may be solved by this coordinating council, and that there can be greater central control over fiscal matters and increased planning of joint aid programs, so as to avoid duplication and lack of direction, and in some instances, diversion of needed food and supplies into unauthorized hands.

I do not wish to detract from the efforts now being made by USOM, the private volunteer agencies, and the South Vietnamese Government.

My purpose today is to direct the attention of this esteemed body to the mounting flood of refugees and the attendant increasing humanitarian needs and political ramifications.

The subcommittee on refugees and escapees is continuing hearings on this problem. We hope within the next few weeks to be able to file a report embodying some of our findings and suggestions.

May I conclude by saying that I cannot stress enough our need to be alert and attuned to the refugee problem in Vietnam, especially in light of an almost certain escalation of the numbers and the needs of these refugees in the near future.

The course of events in Vietnam in part depend on our efforts to help these hapless and needy people.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to commend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for his diligence in alerting the Senate and the people of the United States to a very serious problem which could well affect the course of events in Vietnam.

It has been my privilege to serve on the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, of which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is chairman.

During the past 10 days he has been holding extensive hearings. There has been testimony before the committee by many persons from private agencies who have just come from Vietnam. They have testified that the problem of the refugees is very serious, because in the event that the Vietcong terroristic tactics are sufficient to force great masses of refugees into the capital in Saigon, there could conceivably be severe diplomatic repercussions around the world, as well

as military and economic repercussions in Saigon and Vietnam itself.

Therefore, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is performing a fine service by calling to the attention of the Senate and the administration this problem, which today perhaps may seem small, but in reality is of great import in the conduct of our effort in Vietnam, and the successful conclusion thereof.

I congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. His efforts are extremely worthwhile, and I hope that he will persevere in this area.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JAVITS obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have made some inquiries of the Parliamentarian. I believe I mentioned this to the Senator from New York.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go out of executive session and return to legislative session.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Chair please state the request, because other Senators have spoken to me with respect to the question. Will the Chair state what the Chair is passing upon? I myself have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The majority leader has asked unanimous consent that the Senate go out of executive session and return to legislative session. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am sorry, but I missed the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana asked unanimous consent to have the Senate vacate or leave executive session and go into legislative session.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished majority leader his purpose in moving that the Senate go into legislative session. There are rumors—and I think they are substantiated—that as soon as the Senate goes into legislative session, the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] my friend and my colleague, will then move to take up the American Legion baseball bill and will then, if he is successful, move to bring up his constitutional amendment, which I think should be called the "foul ball" amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Illinois, if he wishes me to yield to him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. To which Senator from Illinois does the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The two Senators from Illinois are on the floor. I do not desire to take the floor from the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. If the senior Senator from Illinois wishes me to yield to him, I shall gladly do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I do not wish to have the Senator from New York yield to me; I should like to have him continue.

NOMINATION OF JAMES P. COLEMAN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I oppose the nomination of Gov. James P. Coleman, of Mississippi, to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. While I was not a member of the subcommittee which was appointed to consider the nomination, I am a member of the full Committee on the Judiciary and was, through the courtesy of the chairman, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], permitted to attend the hearings and to question the nominee.

I approached the nomination with an open mind, as any lawyer should, but because of the serious questions which had been raised concerning Governor Coleman's background, I attended all the hearings and questioned witnesses extensively.

Thereafter, I reviewed the record thoroughly and gave further serious thought to the nomination before reaching my decision, since no Senator should lightly register his disapproval of a Presidential appointment.

At the outset, let me emphasize that neither I nor any of the witnesses who testified against Governor Coleman, so far as I could ascertain, had any information which would indicate that he is not an able lawyer, and a man of personal honesty and integrity. Rather, my opposition is based upon the belief that a man who has demonstrated by word and action that he harbors so relatively recently a deep-seated conviction contrary to the law of the land—namely, on the issue of the segregation of the races—should not be appointed to this high post; for, in my judgment, to speculate that any man having such an impressive set of segregationist credentials will change is a gamble that the Senate and the Nation should not be called upon to take.

Three factors have brought me to this decision: First, the critical importance of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals at this time; second, Governor Coleman's record on civil rights matters as a public official; and third, the precedent the Senate would be setting in confirming this nomination.

Taking these matters up point by point, the Fifth Circuit encompasses the States of Mississippi, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas. One-third of the Nation's Negroes live in those States, and the vast majority of civil rights cases come before the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. As one who has worked throughout my career in Congress for effective civil rights legislation, I believe strongly that judges whose impartiality and dedication to the U.S. Constitution have been demonstrated beyond peradventure should be appointed to this bench.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964, in its various aspects, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, when it is enacted, will be tested in the Fifth Circuit. Laws which Governor Coleman signed when he was the chief executive of Mississippi also will be tested in that circuit. I hasten to add that Governor Coleman commendably stated that he would disqualify himself from sitting in such cases; but I use the reference here only to point out the importance of the Fifth Circuit so far as Federal civil rights laws are concerned.

Convictions of civil rights demonstrators will be transferred to Federal courts and will be appealed, perhaps, to the Supreme Court of the United States, through this circuit.

It is regrettable, therefore, that when such a vital post is at stake, the Senate has been asked by the President to advise and consent to the nomination of a man whose personal convictions on these important matters run counter to the will of Congress and the decisions of the Supreme Court.

I now wish to refer to a letter contained in the hearings. At page 137 of the hearings is a letter from Mark DeWolfe Howe, a professor at the Harvard Law School. He opposes the confirmation of Governor Coleman's nomination and says in his letter:

In view of the conditions which now prevail in the Fifth Circuit, however, I cannot persuade myself that an appointment to a judicial vacancy in that circuit is justified when it is based upon the hope that a political record already made will have no bearing on the judicial responsibility yet to be fulfilled.

I repeat those words for the Senate:

... is based upon the hope that a political record already made will have no bearing on a judicial responsibility yet to be fulfilled.

It is hoped, of course, that if the Senate should confirm the nomination of Governor Coleman, he will administer the laws, including the civil rights laws, fairly and without diversion and delay. That has not always been the case with Federal judges in the Fifth Circuit. Nonetheless, I am willing to agree that Governor Coleman, as he testified before the committee, gave every appearance of being a man who in good faith intended to do his duty as a judge, even by these laws.

Our judgment must be based upon whether the convictions of Governor Coleman, as shown by the record, are so deeply built into his conscious personality as well as into his subconscious personality that he could really and truly be an exemplary judge in terms of the law as laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States and by Congress—laws which he has spent all his public life opposing, and, whether we have any right, under these circumstances, to pick him out, notwithstanding his ability as a lawyer, and to say, "You are the man whose nomination we will confirm to be a judge of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals."

For myself, I have answered that question, without any derogation whatsoever of the character, veracity, or good faith